DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 129 JC 990 149

AUTHOR Lyons, Richard E.
TITLE A Study of the Effects of a Mentoring Initiative on the Performance of New Adjunct Community College Faculty.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 191p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Central Florida.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjunct Faculty; *Beginning Teacher Induction; Community Colleges; Faculty Development; Interpersonal Relationship; *Mentors; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Indian River Community College FL; Teacher Needs

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of a mentoring initiative on the performance of ten adjunct instructors new to the faculty of Indian River Community College in east-central Florida. Participants represent a wide range of discipline areas, motivations and demographic characteristics. The mentoring program focused on general pedagogical skills and classroom practices for varying disciplines. The study's primary question asks what value a mentoring initiative will offer to new faculty above and beyond the traditional relationship with the key contact person. Secondary research questions include: (1) the degree of structure that should be incorporated into the initiative design; (2) the most significant needs of new adjuncts that are not addressed by the traditional key contact person; (3) factors that affect the degree of those needs; (4) responsiveness of the adjuncts to the initiatives; and (5) mentoring characteristics (age, race gender) that contribute to an effective mentor-mentee match. Findings indicated that all participants finishing the study perceived the mentoring initiative as valuable. Those who derived the greatest benefit were participants who had some previous teaching experience and/or former mentoring relationships, and who accessed the mentor frequently. The mentor's interpersonal skills played a more significant role in the success of the mentoring relationship than did his/her demographic characteristics. Appendices A-E contain the research agreement and study overview, interview guides, instructor/course evaluation form, orientation checklist for new adjunct faculty, and an instructor effectiveness training outline. Contains 51 references. (AS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 129

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF A MENTORING INITIATIVE ON THE PERFORMANCE OF NEW ADJUNCT COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

by

RICHARD E. LYONS
B.S. Western Kentucky University, 1972
M.A. Western Kentucky University, 1975

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the Department of Educational Foundations
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
1996

Major Professor: Marcella L. Kysilka

JC 990 149

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE
AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC
COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY,
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.E. Lyons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

© 1996 Richard E. Lyons

ABSTRACT

While American community colleges have historically prided themselves as strong teaching institutions, they are currently reacting to a wide range of political, economic and social pressures by relying more heavily than ever before on underprepared adjunct faculty. At the same time, students entering their doors are increasingly unable to perform academically and are challenged by dysfunctional personal lives and an economy in transition. Visionary leaders in the community college movement realize the coalescing of these factors require them to take proactive measures to ensure that adjunct faculty are adequately equipped to provide the high quality instruction demanded by this complex challenge.

Building upon the findings of a semester-long pilot study with 12 adjuncts, this multi-perspective qualitative study investigated the impact of a mentoring initiative on the performance of 10 adjunct instructors, new to the faculty of Indian River Community College, located in east central Florida. Participants represented a wide range of discipline areas, motivations to teach and demographic characteristics. The mentoring provided focused on general

pedagogical skills and classroom management practices, and was not discipline specific.

The researcher, acting as mentor to the participants, met with each participant at three key mileposts during the semester-long study, gathering data on their experiences, while providing coaching in teaching methods and emotional encouragement. In addition, scheduled as well as spontaneous telephone conversations initiated by the researcher yielded data, as did observations of participants' teaching. Both participants and the researcher maintained journals which provided data checks. In addition, focus groups were conducted with new and veteran adjunct faculty, as well as with instructional deans to provide additional perspective and context to the study.

Findings indicated that all participants finishing the study derived a significant value from the initiative, with those who had some previous teaching experience in another setting and/or a previous mentoring relationship accessing the mentor more frequently and deriving the greatest benefit. This fact seems to indicate that mentoring should not be used to supplant a more structured role to be played by a department chair or other formal discipline leader. The findings also indicated that interpersonal skills of the mentor played a more significant role in the success of the mentoring relationship than did his demographic characteristics.

The study recommends a comprehensive approach to the development of the college's adjunct faculty cadre. Its components should include the development and delivery of a teaching methods course for all new adjunct faculty, the creation and promotion of a materials resource center, a structured set of opportunities for social interaction between full-time and adjunct faculty, as well as the expansion of the mentoring initiative established by the study.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA
DISSERTATION APPROVAL

Date August 2, 1996

I hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared and successfully completed under my approval entitled: A Study of the Effects of a Mentoring Initiative on the Performance of New Adjunct Community College Faculty

by Richard Edward Lyons

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

from the Department of Educational Foundations, College of Education

Marcella L. Kysilka
Marcella L. Kysilka, Chair

Jeffrey W. Cornett
Jeffrey W. Cornett

T. S. Kubala
Thomas S. Kubala

George E Pawlas
George Pawlas

Silvia C Zapico
Silvia C. Zapico

Michael C Hynes
Michael Hynes
Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies

John Powell
John Powell
Interim Dean

Diane M Jacobs
Diane M. Jacobs
Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

FINAL EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

The material presented within this report does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the committee, the College, or the University of Central Florida.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the mentor for an adjunct faculty member is rewarded vicariously for the achievements of his or her mentee, many have contributed in one way or another to the development of this dissertation and therefore deserve a reward for its achievement. I wish to recognize and thank first the members of my doctoral committee. The chair, Dr. Marcella Kysilka, respected and loved by many students who proceeded me, was simply ideal--at times a counselor, at others a taskmaster, but always dedicated to a standard of excellence which has historically epitomized the mentoring relationship between doctoral student and advisor. I thank Dr. Jeff Cornett for his ability to challenge me intellectually and his passion for the qualitative research process. I sincerely appreciate the sensitivity toward students and faculty, as well as the practical community college perspective contributed by Dr. Silvia Zapico. I thank Dr. Tom Kubala for his open-mindedness and ultimate support for my methods and conclusions. And finally, I thank Dr. George Pawlas for continually helping me keep a healthy perspective and enjoy the process of developing the dissertation.

I am greatly indebted to many at Indian River Community College for their support of this effort. I thank President Edwin Massey for supporting my sabbatical and fully embracing the dissertation concept, and my immediate supervisors Drs. Ray Isenburg and Jack Maxwell for believing in me enough to free up my schedule for both coursework and research. I thank the members of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee, under the leadership of Dean Dottie Vandegrift and Dr. David Sullivan, for their logistical and emotional support. I also thank Dr. Norma Thompson, for her counsel during those often challenging days of putting word to paper. And finally, there are scores of colleagues, from the divisional deans and department chairs, to librarians and support staff, without whose willingness to provide all manner of support this dissertation simply would not have been possible.

Finally, I want to thank the 40 adjunct faculty members who participated in either the pilot study, the final study or the focus groups, for their courage in opening themselves up for examination and dedication to their own continuous self-improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I--INTRODUCTION 1
  Research Question and Subsidiary Questions 11
  Definition of Terms 13
  Assumptions 14
  Limitations 14
  Procedures 15
  Significance 16

CHAPTER II--REVIEW OF LITERATURE 17
  Characteristics of the Community College Adjunct . 19
  Adjunct Faculty Development Efforts 29
  Mentoring as a Developmental Tool for Adjunct Faculty 33

CHAPTER III--METHODS AND PROCEDURES 46
  Research Design 46
  Pilot Study 48
  Setting 50
  Participants 51
  Instruments 52
  Data Collection 55
  Data Analysis 61

CHAPTER IV--ANALYSIS OF DATA 62
  Primary Question 62
  Subsidiary Questions 62
  Profiles of the Participants 64
  Perspectives from Focus Groups 111
  The Development of the Mentor 118
  Summary 134

CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 140
  Conclusions 141
  Recommendations 149
  Recommendations for Further Research 155

APPENDIXES 158
  A. Research Agreement and Study Overview 159
  B. Interview Guides 164
  C. Instructor/Course Evaluation Form 169

D. Orientation Checklist for New Adjunct Faculty. 171
E. Instructor Effectiveness Training Outline . . 174

LIST OF REFERENCES 176

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For decades, America's community, technical and junior colleges have prided themselves on being the "teaching college" within the larger framework of American higher education (O'Banion, 1995). Attention to students' needs and limitations, a function of the localized role of the 1200 institutions, has been the cornerstone of the community college culture. The most successful community colleges continue to assess the value of their actions by the one overarching evaluative criterion--Is it best for the student? (Roueche, Roueche & Milliron, 1995). Community colleges have become the primary higher education choice of racial minorities, women, the economic lower class and older students (Witt, Wattenbarger, Gollattscheck & Suppiger, 1994). Such students, as well as increasing numbers of recent high school graduates, are often underprepared for academic reality, are working too many hours, juggling family responsibilities, with insufficient support from family and friends, and are unclear on what they want to do with their lives. Together these factors have greatly impacted the ability of community college faculties to maintain their teaching effectiveness (Roueche & Roueche, 1994).

An even deeper penetration into the question of maintaining teaching effectiveness reveals that the "at risk" student is more likely to be part-time and to enroll in courses offered in the evening or on weekends. Courses offered at such times are far more likely to be taught by part-time instructors, because that is when they are more likely to be available and when full-time faculty are least likely to teach. In fact, in some especially large, urban community colleges, the weakest academic students are taught exclusively by part-time instructors. Junior colleges, the forerunner of community colleges, relied on part-time faculty during the 1920s and 30s, but they were drawn nearly exclusively from the ranks of the best public school teachers in their service areas. Since then, while the number of part-time faculty has steadily increased, especially over the last 30 years, they have increasingly been drawn from non-teaching backgrounds (Roueche et al., 1995).

In the last few years, as American voters have become increasingly hostile toward large government and its perceived "bloated budgets" and concerns about issues, such as crime and health care, have increased competition for scarce tax dollars, funding for education in general, and community colleges in particular, has become more restricted. The ability of community colleges to maintain instructional effectiveness has been further challenged with the issuance of standard marching orders of "do more with less money." Since personnel costs comprise the greatest financial expense of community colleges, many institutions have adopted a variety of methods to decrease the cost of delivering instruction, including increasing the size of course sections and thus the teacher-student ratio, as well as employing technology more extensively to deliver instruction (Gross, 1995).

Perhaps the most controversial change however, from a variety of viewpoints, has been the reconceptualizing of entire budgets to employ a less-expensive teaching cadre, with adjuncts as an essential component of the instructional core (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). This strategy has been especially noticeable as increasing numbers of full-time faculty retire or otherwise vacate their teaching assignments and full-time positions are supplanted with several part-timers (O'Banion, 1994). Part-time faculty have grown to represent 58.3% of all faculty teaching in member institutions of the American Association of Community Colleges--more than all of the rest of higher education combined (Avakian, 1995), delivering 33.6% of all the instructional credit hours. Since the per-credit-hour of instruction cost for an adjunct is generally less than half of a full-time faculty member's pay, and few, if any fringe benefit costs are incurred, the total instructional costs can be dramatically decreased. Per capita support costs are also reduced because adjuncts typically are not provided offices, therefore decreasing maintenance and utility costs (Roueche et al., 1995).

Although reducing operating costs is clearly the major advantage, the use of adjunct faculty provide additional advantages as well. Flexibility to the decision-maker of class assignments is highly-valued, as it is quite common for total community colleges enrollments to fluctuate inversely with the health of the economy and demand for specific courses to wax and wane for a wide variety of reasons. Qualified adjuncts also allow many colleges to teach highly specialized courses that would otherwise be excluded from the curriculum (Cohen, 1992). Adjuncts are often credited with offering insights from the "real world" and emerging disciplines from which full-time faculty are often removed (Roueche et al. 1995). Often, adjuncts offer linkages between the college and the community which might contribute more current information to the classroom than full-time faculty can provide. Adjuncts might also provide linkages to rich resources such as guest presenters and businesses, as well as opportunities for program development by serving the specialized training needs of area employers (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Lastly, many adjuncts bring a passion for teaching and their areas of expertise which some full-timers have lost. Perhaps it is their youthfulness and newness to the teaching field which generates a high level of energy and creativity, or their more recent experience with graduate education which might put them closer to the cutting edge in their fields, or perhaps it is the practical examples and diverse perspectives which they bring to the classroom (Roueche et al., 1995). For a range of reasons, above and beyond the cost consideration, what started out as a "temporary fix" to some of the challenges facing community colleges has become a critical, permanent component of the culture (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Our attention then must logically turn to the question of adjunct effectiveness. Nearly 30% of community college adjuncts are employed full-time in public schools or universities (Lee & Maitland, 1995) and can probably be assumed to possess adequate pedagogical skills. Since adjunct instructors average 8 to 10 years of professional experience (Maitland, 1995), they typically begin their instruction from a sound knowledge base (Cohen, 1992). Over 35% have taught more than 4 years in their current institutions, and perhaps possess additional experience at other institutions prior to their current employment (Roueche et al., 1995) While there are obvious examples of exceptional performance by adjuncts, there are admittedly many cases of poor performance, such as lack of organization, ineffective lecturing and unsatisfactory testing practices. Studies indicated, however, that adjuncts, on the average, receive the same range of ratings and achieve the same range of student outcomes as full-time faculty (McGuire, 1993). The lack of supervision, training and evaluation which adjuncts typically receive serves to exacerbate the failure of adjuncts in the eyes of students, who are increasingly consumer-oriented toward educational services. In addition, the common perception has emerged among full-time faculty that adjuncts are not as effective as full-time faculty. This may be largely due to the dramatic negative impact new adjunct instructors are likely to make in their very first teaching assignment, especially when that assignment is made at the last minute, as is so often the case. Some even say that college teaching has become bifurcated into two adversarial faculties--the tenured "haves" and the part-time "have-nots," with the student being impacted by the mutual lack of respect between the two groups. Clearly, this bifurcation must be addressed proactively at all levels of the institution (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

As the number of adjuncts continues to grow, constituting an ever larger share of teaching assignments, community colleges increasingly risk their ability to be effective with a continually more challenging student clientele. On a higher plane, can any community college which proposes to embrace the values of student individuality, high academic and personal standards and a lifelong quest for excellence, as most do, permit the increased use of underprepared adjunct faculty in its classrooms and labs? The answer should be a definitive "no!" What is the effective community college to do? The key obviously lies in getting away from the traditional practice of "survival of the fittest", in which weak adjuncts have been culled out literally in front of their students, by finding a way to enhance the chances for success in the initial teaching assignment of each adjunct. Successful first-time adjuncts are more likely to want to return to teach the following semester, reducing the effort at recruiting new adjuncts, and building continuity within programs. Such a mindset fits into a larger paradigm shift now being proposed by proponents of Total Quality Management (TQM), a movement growing in popularity on community college campuses which seeks to restructure the delivery of education to more effectively meet the needs of the evermore demanding student (Cross, 1994).

Currently, professional development activities for adjunct faculty are rare among community colleges--a clear indication of being "penny-wise and pound foolish" (Lankard, 1993). On an apparently small scale, several tactics are being tried by some community colleges, with or without a long-term view, achieving a mixed degree of effectiveness. Some community colleges have developed a policy that adjunct instruction will be limited to a certain percentage, or certain category, of its course offerings. Given a political climate which would seem to bode unfavorably for greater funding of public education in the near future, this strategy, if extensively employed, would seem untenable over the foreseeable future (McGuire, 1993).

Others have suggested that colleges should adopt a more stringent selection process for its adjunct instructors, which includes an extensive amount of prior teaching/training experience. While this suggestion would seem to embrace an ideal which colleges should integrate into their philosophy, the reality is that precious few such adjuncts probably exist, and with the limited salaries being offered, it is difficult to conceive of significantly more qualified adjunct faculty being attracted in sufficient numbers to teach the evening and weekend courses for which the demand is greatest (Avakian, 1995).

More stringent evaluation of adjunct teaching performance earlier in their teaching assignments, so that weak performers can be identified and either provided additional training or weeded out of the faculty, is a frequently suggested, though apparently rarely used, tool. Some colleges have initiated recognition programs for those operating at the high end of the effectiveness scale, in hopes of providing more realistic role models for adjuncts (Erwin & Andrews, 1993). A strategy of more effective and frequent evaluation mistakenly assumes however that some administrator or department chair has the discretionary time to effectively conduct the evaluations.

Apparently the most frequently employed tactic of adjunct faculty development is the adoption of a requirement to complete a course or series of workshops or courses, with very specific and applicable skills in classroom management, prior to or concurrently with their assignment to a class. Several colleges have gone so far as to develop a package of courses with a special designation, e.g., "Master Teacher Certification" (Yantz & Bechtold, 1994) or "Associate Program" (Richardson, 1992), whose completers acquire a status and special benefits beyond the acquisition of pedagogical skills. While such courses or packages have the benefits of convenience and widespread acceptance, they often inadequately address the unique needs of each adjunct and the special nature of certain teaching assignments. They are largely, if not exclusively, driven by the needs of the institution and the efficient use of its resources. Additionally, such programs run the risk of raising adjuncts' expectations for continued employment and reducing administrative flexibility, which is one of the major benefits of using adjunct faculty in the first place.

Lastly, a few but growing number of community colleges have recently chosen to employ a tactic whose roots extend back to Greek mythology, when Odysseus, prior to setting off on a 10-year journey, entrusted his house and son Telemachus to an old man called "Mentor." The father-like relationship between the young man and the wise, loving Mentor set a standard for characterizing future mentoring relationships. From the legacy of famous mentoring relationships comes the sense of mentoring as a powerful emotional interaction between a veteran and novice, in which the growth and development of the newcomer is shaped through trust, love and experience (Merriam, 1983). With the advent of affirmative action, mentoring enjoyed a widespread resurgence of popularity in the corporate world, which was seeking an effective way for assimilating members of protected classes into the work force, and has since found increased popularity in other environments as well.

As contrasted with the previous developmental methods discussed, mentoring is largely, if not exclusively, driven by the specific needs of the person being helped. In the case of the new adjunct faculty member, this seems especially important. As possessor of rich storehouses of practical experiences, new adjuncts often nonetheless feel isolated and outside of their comfort zone (Cohen, 1992). They may derive little value from a "crash course" in pedagogical skills and in fact, may sense their self-efficacy is under attack, e.g., when required to deliver a mock lesson in front of peers. While the effective mentor can anticipate times when certain types of help might be needed by the adjunct and would be able to communicate a more conceptual view of the teaching assignment, the mentor would also recognize that adjuncts are more likely to identify their shortcomings when appropriate methods to uncover them are used. Adjuncts' success in the classroom will be largely built upon and continually linked to their self-efficacy and personal knowledge base, rather than some list of skills and attitudes imposed by the institution.

With the increasing intensity of the financial crisis impacting community colleges, interest in more effectively understanding the potential role and impact of adjunct teaching is manifest. Little research is available on the recruitment, retention, and training of adjunct faculty for community college teaching. This study examined a mentoring initiative, conducted at Indian River Community College in Fort Pierce, Florida, and assessed its potential for contributing to the effective development of adjunct faculty in a variety of disciplines.

Research Question and Subsidiary Questions

This was a qualitative study designed to explore the role of a mentoring initiative on a group of 10 new adjunct faculty members. The research questions were designed to bring a focus and framework to the issue while allowing for the consideration of pertinent data that might emerge as the study progressed. Thus, the study was guided by one primary question, and, according to the key stakeholders in the study, five subsidiary questions. Formally stated, the questions are:

Primary Question

What value will a mentoring initiative offer a new adjunct faculty member at Indian River Community College, above and beyond the traditional relationship with the key contact person?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What degree of structure should be incorporated into the design of the initiative?
2. What are the most significant needs of new adjuncts not presently being addressed by the traditional relationship with a key contact person?
3. What factors affect the degree of needs of new adjuncts?
4. To what degree will new adjuncts avail themselves of the services offered by the mentor?
5. What mentor characteristics, including age, race and gender, contribute to an effective mentor-mentee match?

Definition of Terms

Adjunct instructor--A person employed on a part-time basis to deliver instruction in a classroom or laboratory, or at an off-campus community or business location. It was recognized that this term is occasionally used to denote a degree of permanency in the relationship between college and instructor, but it was used nonetheless because anecdotal research indicates the term is more preferred than the term "part-timer" by those teaching in this arrangement.

Community college--An institution designed to serve the higher education needs of the community, which offers the first 2 years of a baccalaureate degree, occupational education and adult continuing education.

Key contact person--An individual charged with providing discipline specific information and support. In most cases, this was 1 of the 29 department chairpersons, while in a few cases, it was an instructional dean.

Mentor--A veteran teacher who volunteered to serve as a role model, sponsor, guide, teacher, advisor, coach and/or confidant for a mentee.

Mentee--An adjunct instructor new to the institution within the current academic year, who received instruction, coaching and other forms of support from a mentor.

Traditional relationship--Each adjunct instructor initially met with their "key contact person" to receive their teaching assignment and materials, and in the process established an ongoing communications link on matters related to delivering that teaching assignment.

Assumptions

1. The sample was representative of new adjunct faculty teaching concurrently at Indian River Community College.
2. The issues and concerns identified by members of the sample were consistent with those new adjuncts who were not participants in the study.
3. The mentoring provided was non-discipline focused and based upon a pedagogical knowledge and experience base consistent with a hypothetical group of recruited mentors.
4. Mentees had a traditional relationship established with a key contact person, usually a department chair, who provided content related support.

Limitations

The study was subject to the following limitations:

1. As a qualitative study, it presented a detailed account of the phenomenon, without any manipulation of variables. It was not motivated by a desire to formulate general hypotheses (Merriam, 1988).
2. This study examined one community college, with campuses in Fort Pierce, Vero Beach, Port Saint

Lucie, Stuart and Okeechobee, Florida, which may not be representative of other community colleges.

3. Serving as the mentor to the study's participants, the researcher risked being somewhat influenced by his direct participation in the study.

Procedures

A pilot study, with 12 new adjunct faculty, was conducted during the Fall 1995 semester, to test procedures and instruments. Three individual interviews were held with each participant. In addition, two group meetings were held to gather additional information prompted by remarks of the other participants, as well as the researcher.

The final study was conducted during the Spring 1996 semester with 10 new adjuncts. The researcher served as a mentor to each, meeting with them three times--at the beginning of the semester, near midterm and at the close of the semester. When requested, the researcher visited participants' teaching environments, to serve as a coach. Each participant was asked to maintain a journal, recording perceptions of their teaching experiences.

Focus groups were used to solicit additional information, in a non-threatening, collegial environment. Separate groups of adjuncts and instructional deans were utilized to provide perspective and context to the study.

Significance

Research on the effective use of adjunct faculty members in community colleges was very limited (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). Research on mentoring as a tool for developing the teaching skills of adjunct faculty in community colleges was almost nonexistent. This study will help build an understanding of the teaching and support needs of new adjunct faculty, and the role that a mentoring initiative can play in meeting those needs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For the last 3 decades, the use of adjunct faculty in community colleges has been widely perceived as a "temporary fix," until funding became available to staff the institution with qualified full-time faculty. Typically, adjuncts were viewed as "an anonymous mass of laboring drones," albeit whose low cost and heavy teaching loads helped make possible the continuation of a tenure system which protected the perquisites and very jobs of full-time faculty members. There developed little interest in investigating such a "temporary" and little noticed phenomenon, and thus little research on it was conducted. As full-timers and some administrators became concerned about the lack of continuity in programs and perceived decline in student satisfaction with their instruction that the increased use of adjuncts created, it also became common to assume a decline in overall teaching quality. A self-fulfilling prophecy began to infect the entire climate in which academic staffing decisions were made, with full-time faculty, administrators and even some students viewing adjunct instructors as implicitly less effective than their full-time counterparts. Again, little if any scientific documentation to support that perception has been reported (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Nationally, the number of adjuncts teaching in community colleges continued to climb, reaching over 145,000 in 1992. Becoming more clear are the economic considerations which would favor increasing both the number and responsibilities of adjuncts. Enrollments are forecasted to grow as waves of older returning and first-time-in-college adults swell class rolls, while shrinking budgets push adjuncts' share of the teaching assignments higher (Roueche, Roueche & Milliron, 1995). The increased use of adjunct instructors mirrors, and is probably reinforced by, a greater reliance in the economy's private sector on "contingent" workers. The employing organization is rapidly being transformed from a structure built out of positions into a dynamic mass of work needing to be done (Bridges, 1994).

Only with the realization of the permanency of the fix of employing adjuncts has there come any significant interest and therefore a trickle of research on their use (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). The review of that limited research will be divided into three sections. The first will seek to delineate who the community college adjunct instructor is, demographically, psychographically and psychologically. The second will highlight the limited methods community colleges have employed to develop the teaching skills of their adjunct faculty members. The last section will review what is known about mentoring, with an eye toward its use as a tool for the development of community college adjuncts.

Characteristics of the Community College Adjunct

As one seeks to understand who the adjunct community college instructor is, it must be noted that the profile can only be derived from a patchwork of sources. While some data specific to the community college adjunct is clearly known, other very valuable data is available only as they are lumped with part-time instructors from all levels of higher education.

The most current data indicates 58% of community college part-timers are male and 42% female, as compared with 73% of full-timers who are male, and 27% who are female (Roueche, et al., 1995). The fact that the academic part-time work force is far more female than the full-time may well be an indicator of the inflexibility of a tenure system that often conflicts with women's prime childbearing years. Women who wish to balance their commitments to family and career are forced to accept less reward and secure forms of work to a greater extent than are men (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

A large majority of adjunct instructors have extensive, successful, non-academic work experience, and it might be inferred, the ability to make extensive "real world" applications. Adjuncts tend to be somewhat younger than full-time faculty members and less formally educated, although a large majority have at least one master's degree. They have frequently chosen part-time teaching over pursuing higher degrees. Because of their outside work experience and lower relative age, many adjuncts are often relatively comfortable with the technology that is beginning to largely influence the delivery of instruction. Adjuncts are more likely to have been students at community colleges than full-timers have been, and it could be logically surmised, more likely to have been raised in the college's service area and therefore more frequently to have been students at the specific community college at which they were teaching. Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, adjunct faculty members tend however to be slightly less racially and ethnically diverse than full-time faculty (Roueche, et al., 1995). While some are veteran instructors of many years, over half of the adjuncts in all of higher education have taught at their present institutions for 4 years or less (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

On balance, the conclusion can be drawn that adjuncts are more similar demographically and psychographically to the typical community college student than are full-time faculty. Given the increasing diversity of students, as defined in its broadest context, many educators believe community college learning can be markedly enriched by adjunct faculty members, as long as they are effectively prepared to teach (McGaughey, 1985).

Several attempts have been made to develop typologies of part-time faculty. The first and most-often cited was that developed by Howard Tuckman in 1978. He studied 3,763 part-timers at all levels of higher education, 52.6% of whom taught at community and junior colleges. This study differentiated seven mutually exclusive categories of part-time faculty.

"Full-mooners" were those who held full-time positions in addition to their part-time teaching duties. This group, which comprised 27.6% of Tuckman's sample, included many who taught full-time at another single institution, as well as those employed in business or governmental entities, or who were self-employed professionals. This group consisted of persons with a wider range of education and work histories than the other categories, and also the most limited in time to devote to preparation for teaching assignments.

"Students," comprising 21.1% of the sample, were typically full-time graduate students at universities, employed outside the departments in which they were seeking degrees. Some were enrolled in classes, while others were developing their dissertations. They taught to gain experience and/or to augment their incomes. The variance in this category's percentage among community colleges would likely be great, contingent largely upon the college's geographical proximity to a university which grants doctoral degrees.

"Hopeful full-timers" were those who were teaching part-time at one or more institutions, seeking to demonstrate their worthiness for a full-time teaching position. They comprised 16.6% of Tuckman's sample, but may well have increased in number and percentage since then because of the decline in the number of full-time faculty positions and other factors. Frequently, such adjuncts were willing to accept additional unpaid duties, such as substituting for full-time faculty members attending conferences, serving on advisory committees and coordinating the flow of paperwork to government agencies mandating various standards, hoping to further demonstrate their viability for full-time employment. Current academic and mainstream publications are replete with stories of "freeway fliers," "roadrunners" or "gypsy scholars," employed at several institutions of higher and perhaps K-12 education, who seek to maximize their exposure to employment decision-makers and/or generate financial rewards which approach those of a full-time position.

"Part-mooners" were those who simultaneously held two or more part-time jobs, but whose concern was largely more economic than career-focused. They comprised 13.6% of the sample and were often seeking full-time employment, albeit often outside academe.

"Homeworkers" were those who taught part-time but were not seeking full-time employment, because they were caring for a relative or child at home. Representing 6.4% of the sample, these individuals were often otherwise unemployed spouses of someone employed full-time, who possessed a variety of credentials and experiences. They taught for a wide range of personal and financial reasons.

"Semi-retireds" were persons who were previously employed full-time, either inside or outside academe, often gathering rich experiences and abilities, and were seeking activities to enrich their retirement. Although they comprised only 2.8% of Tuckman's sample, it is quite possible that many community colleges, especially those located in the Sun Belt, count a much larger percentage of this category among their adjunct cadre. Semi-retireds are the most distinct and homogeneous group of part-timers and are the group most like full-timers.

The remaining 11.8% of part-timers comprised the "part-unknowners" category. They worked part-time for unknown, transitory or highly subjective reasons. Many in this category had a high preference for leisure or recreational activity over work, while others were in transition between jobs and valued staying connected to the academic world.

Most of the participants in the study claimed to be relatively satisfied with their careers, with their teaching providing a valuable form of equilibrium. "Hopeful Full-Timers" were the exception, and was the category of individuals most likely to be discontented and unhappy with the reduced earnings they must accept to remain in academe (Tuckman, 1978).

A degree of caution should be applied in interpreting Tuckman's findings. While his categories are seemingly appropriate for all levels of higher education, the percentages within each category may be significantly different in community colleges as a whole, but especially perhaps in those located in rural areas or remote, smaller cities. In addition, the nature of employment during the nearly 20 years since the study was conducted has changed dramatically, e.g. severe corporate downsizing, improvement in the employment status of women and minorities, increased number of small, service-oriented businesses, etc., possibly impacting the nature and to some extent the percentages of his categories.

With Tuckman's taxonomy in mind, Gappa and Leslie developed in 1993 a second typology of adjuncts, again encompassing those employed in all forms of higher education. Their system did not purport to reflect as much a research base as it attempted to describe the factors which differentiate adjuncts.

"Career enders" were those who comprised Tuckman's "semi-retireds," but who were believed to account for a much higher proportion of all adjuncts than the under 3% in Tuckman's study. This increase was attributable to several factors, including the movement toward more enriched lifestyles and the extension of life spans in the 15 years since the Tuckman study was conducted.

The "specialist, expert or professional" category was comprised solely of Tuckman's "full-mooners," but its title more accurately reflected the career and lifestyle considerations which attracted someone to teaching part-time. Again, it was believed that the percentage within this category was significantly greater than the 27.6% in Tuckman's study.

"Aspiring academics" were comprised of Tuckman's "hopeful full-timers" and "students," and held terminal degrees or were ABD. Often employed at several institutions, they were typically geographically limited and therefore especially common in metropolitan areas. Often dubbed "freeway fliers," "aspiring academics" have become the focus of widespread anecdotes in recent years. When all of their assignments were totaled, "aspiring academics" frequently carried heavier than full-time teaching loads, although they received little if any fringe benefits.

"Freelancers" were a composite of Tuckman's "part-unknowners," "part-mooners" and "homeworkers." They tended to value independence and having a number of options available for enriching their lifestyles (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

A third, and for purposes of this study less-appropriate, taxonomy classifies part-timers on the basis of their degree of attachment to the community college employing them, as a means of researching policy considerations toward employment. Developed in a study conducted by Biles and Tuckman in 1986, this taxonomy categorized adjuncts into four groups.

"Moonlighters" were persons employed in another job who typically taught one course. They were provided no fringe benefits, no tenure consideration or sabbatical accrual, no student advisees or committee work and were provided no vote in departmental decisions.

"Twilighters" were persons who were not otherwise employed, but to whom the community college chose not to give a permanent part-time faculty position. While they had no vote in departmental decisions, they received prorated benefits and had longer contracts.

"Sunlighters" received regular faculty appointments and were treated like regular full-time faculty in every way except in the amount of work they were assigned. They received prorated fringe benefits, committee assignments and advisees, and were eligible for tenure and sabbatical accrual. They completed a probationary period and had an opportunity to later negotiate for full-time faculty status.

"Persons on occasional part-time leave" retained regular full-time faculty appointments and had their probationary period extended proportionately. They could extend their part-time leave or return to full-time status as they wished. This category was dominated by, but was not exclusive to women who had small children (Biles & Tuckman, 1986).

Applications of any of these taxonomies are somewhat problematic, failing to fully explain completely who adjuncts truly are, or the specific role they play in their institutions. They do serve however to underscore the simple fact that there is great diversity in the backgrounds and motivation of adjunct community college faculty, that no doubt impacts a range of issues, including designing a system which markedly enhances adjuncts' ability to deliver effective instruction (Roueche, et al., 1995).

Most part-timers derive their principal satisfaction from the intrinsic rewards of teaching. They are excited and challenged by their students and the engagement in teaching and learning (Gappa & Leslie, 1993). At a time when large numbers of full-time faculty are nearing retirement and no doubt simply "putting in their time," this reservoir of energy and fresh ideas offer the community college a valuable potential resource for rejuvenating its classrooms. Those factors are not being appropriately nurtured by most institutions.

In their first teaching assignments, many adjuncts have come to develop a sense of loneliness and isolation. Commonly, they receive minimal orientation to their teaching assignment, little, if any, supervision during the semester, and they soon learn that they can teach the course more or less as they wish. The infrequency of contact with either full-time faculty, or even other adjuncts, contributes to low morale, perhaps even an adversarial mindset, (Arden, 1995), as well as "turnover" and the likelihood that the college will need to recruit another adjunct to cover the assignment the following term.

Lastly, it should be recognized that moving quickly into the status of potential adjunct faculty are members of "Generation X"--that group within the American population born between the years 1961 and 1982. Their experiences and resulting values tend to contrast markedly with those making employment decisions. On the one hand, they are generally more able to identify with the traditionally-aged community college student, but on the other hand, they tend to be far less willing to invest discretionary time in such tedious activities as preparing lesson plans, and tend to be less loyal to employing institutions (Howe & Strauss, 1993). The increased need to employ members of this generation as adjuncts might require the community college to become more active in its efforts of developing adjunct faculty. Clearly, adjunct community college faculty are not the stereotypical, anonymous mass previously assumed. Their diversity of demographic characteristics, academic and professional development backgrounds, their rich experiences and their fresh motivations to teach part-time make it impossible to assign them simple or inclusive labels. They are emerging as an evermore valuable resource, which markedly contributes to the overall success or failure of community colleges in their mission to serve the increasingly diverse and demanding students of the new millennium (Roueche et al., 1995).

Adjunct Faculty Development Efforts

In recent years, a paradox has developed at many community colleges. At the same time usage of underprepared adjunct instructors has continued to grow, a number of forces are dictating an increased interest in more effective teaching. Besides the increasing number of students in the classroom who do not understand very well, these forces include the rising tide of consumerism which rewards a college's reputation as a quality teaching institution, accountability to governmental and accrediting agencies and the increasing tendency of society to reward the individual's and organization's acquisition of knowledge (Davis, 1993). Faculty development has historically met with serious obstacles. These include the view that a teacher's performance is an individual and private matter -- one that is encouraged largely through academic freedom, and that teaching is an art that cannot be taught (Roueche, et al., 1995). While this system may have served the institution fairly well when instruction was dominated by full-time professors, it is clearly untenable when instruction is dominated by adjuncts who have had relatively little preparation for teaching (Gappa, 1984).

While the clamor about a perceived decline in teaching quality has become an almost self-fulfilling prophecy, very little continues to be done to actually develop faculty teaching performance. In those situations where adjuncts were shown to be the least effective, it can be documented that they were the most likely to have had little or no instructional support. Part-timers cannot be held primarily responsible for whatever declines may have occurred in the quality of postsecondary education. Department chairs, the principal point of contact with adjuncts, who use substantial numbers of part-timers, are underprepared and administratively overwhelmed in trying to deal responsibly with part-time faculty issues (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

Faculty and staff development budgets have declined with the financial crisis and continue to be largely spent on sending a small minority of full-time faculty to academic conferences which have little if any impact on the college's overall teaching effectiveness. In the current environment, funds for developing adjunct instructional effectiveness are small and shrinking even further. When it is rarely addressed, adjunct faculty development is nearly exclusively an internal initiative (Roueche, et al., 1995).

Several studies conducted in recent years provide evidence that concern for the development of adjunct development has surfaced. While highly limited in scope, these studies do begin to provide valuable insights.

Valent (1992) conducted a study to identify the factors which influence the staff development needs of adjuncts, as perceived by both their supervisors and the adjuncts themselves. Despite the supervisors' perceptions of providing ample facilitative interactions and sharing of information, materials and teaching techniques, the part-time faculty consistently reported that their needs were not sufficiently addressed by either supervisory personnel or by full-time faculty. The context and the agenda of each stakeholder group, all of which were integral to the productive functioning of adjuncts, were not well defined and hence not recognized by the others.

According to McGrath and Spear (1988), the reliance of community colleges on the methods of faculty development which have been utilized for full-time faculty were largely untenable for adjuncts, whose schedules were dictated by other priorities. Even when feasible for smaller groups who might have been attracted to a particular time slot, such courses were often ineffective for those whose knowledge base was at a far different point than the focus of the instruction. A new approach to staff development is needed to formulate activities that are designed to create and sustain academic and intellectual practices, which lead to more collegial relations of all faculty members to one another.

Recognizing that adjuncts teach largely as they have been taught, modeling their behavior on one or a very few memorable instructors, and that research on the teaching-learning process has expanded enormously since many of them completed their formal educations, Davis (1995) undertook a study to evaluate the potential of a pedagogically-based staff development program for adjunct community college faculty. Working with a sample of 10 volunteer adjunct faculty members in an 11-week exercise, Davis reported that knowledge of pedagogic theory and strategy, as well as application of the microskills of lecture, question and student motivation, could be effectively imparted.

One method of faculty development that is being recommended by staff development experts as being particularly well-suited to the schedules and on-going developmental needs of community colleges adjuncts, as well as being extremely cost effective and convenient to the institution, is mentoring. Valent (1992) identified the benefits of mentoring adjunct faculty as the enhancement of the mentor's positive influence, mentees' development of a greater sense of support and acceptance, and the greater opportunity for collegial interaction and its concomitant sharing of useful information, instructional materials and techniques.

Mentoring as a Developmental Tool for Adjunct Faculty

While mentoring can be traced to ancient times, when its first model was a relationship mandated by Odysseus, it evolved primarily as a rather informal activity in the centuries following. History is replete with such relationships as the ones between Socrates and Plato, Freud and Jung, and others which provide anecdotal data on the nature of the dynamics of mentoring.

In recent years, several researchers have sought to more objectively describe the complexities of the mentor relationship and delineate some patterns in its development. Perhaps the most extensive work was done in 1978 by Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson and McKee. Based on research with 40 men, their concept of a mentor included being a teacher, sponsor, counselor, developer of skills and intellect, host, guide and exemplar. Mentoring was seen as synthesizing characteristics of the parent-child relationship and peer support, while really being neither. The mentor relationship was described as an intense form of "love," as lasting 2 to 3 years (at most, 10), and as having an 8-15-year age difference between the parties. In Levinson's sample, the most successful men had mentors as young adults. He concluded that not having a mentor could be a great handicap to one's psychological and career development. He equated poor mentoring in early adulthood with poor parenting in childhood (Merriam, 1983).

Levinson's conclusions have been supported by a longitudinal study of 95 Harvard graduates (Vaillant, 1977). Researchers found that men judged to be the "best outcomes" had been capable of "sustained relationships with loving people" both in their careers and personal lives (p. 337). Those men judged to be the "worst outcomes" had not had mentors and were "least clearly willing to assume responsibility for other adults, . . and to the extent that it can be measured in dollars and cents, they gave less of themselves back to the world" (p. 350). One must wonder if the lack of a mentor relationship in young adulthood stifles the development of such relationships at subsequent mileposts in life, and the potential compound impact of such a phenomenon. Is it plausible for someone who has never had a mentor to develop such a relationship in their late years as they begin a new career, albeit part-time?

Sheehy (1995) has demonstrated significant interest in mentoring from the perspective of psychological growth and development, especially as it is practiced within and between different generations and genders of Americans. Her research supported the finding that those who had achieved success and recognition had typically had a mentor, and cites the lack of female mentors for developing females and the complications inherent in males mentoring women as obstacles. One must wonder about the implications for racial minorities, physically disabled and others, whose "differences" make them perhaps less "attractive" mentees to those who freely choose to be mentors.

The business community has produced a large number of articles and data-based studies on mentoring, typically as it influences career development. The popularity of mentoring in this environment has influenced its acceptance in other settings. While much of that early research produced sophisticated findings, they seem to be totally rooted in a paradigm of a young manager developing his or her career through the organizational maze to reach the upper echelons of the corporate world.

Much of the support for mentoring's potential is traced to a landmark study reported in a 1979 issue of Harvard Business Review (Roche, 1979), in which 1250 esteemed executives responded to a survey about their mentoring relationships. Two-thirds reported having had a relationship with a person who took a personal interest in their career and guided or sponsored them, while one third reported having had two or more mentors. Roche's additional findings included that those who had mentors: earned more money at a younger age; were better educated; were more likely to follow a career plan; sponsored more proteges, and reported being happier with their career and deriving greater pleasure from their work.

The nature of the mentoring relationship within the business world clearly impacts the frequency with which it is found. Several studies, each focusing primarily on full-time workers, seek to delineate a more precise understanding of the phenomenon. Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe (1979) developed a continuum with five categories from the least intensive, which they called "peer pal", through the most intensive, "mentor", which they defined as an intense paternalistic relationship in which an individual assumes the role of both teacher and advocate. In her seminal work on mentors, Phillips-Jones (1982) delineated "primary" from "secondary" mentors. The former was further divided into "informal", i.e. a freely-initiated relationship and "formal" categories, indicating some degree of organizational management of the process. "Secondary" mentors included "peer strategizers," "unsuspecting hero-role model" and "career favor-doers." A number of other, less sophisticated, systems have also been promoted. The overall conclusion is that when thought of as a "sponsor" or "helper", mentoring is quite common, while in its most intense form, it is relatively rare (Merriam, 1983).

Phillips-Jones (1982) identified the advantages of having a mentor as:

1. Advice on career goals;

2. Encouragement;
3. New or improved skills or knowledge;
4. Models to follow;
5. Opportunities and resources;
6. Increased exposure and visibility; and
7. A bridge to "maturity."

She found that effective mentoring relationships also provided meaningful rewards to the mentor, including:

1. Getting more work done through the protege's help;
2. Developing a dependable crucial subordinate;
3. Being rewarded for spotting and developing new talent;
4. Achieving vicariously through proteges;
5. Becoming invested in the protege's future;
6. Getting to repay past debts;
7. Trying to remedy situations for "underdogs";
8. Finding intimate relationships; and
9. Resolving an adult ego stage.

Phillips-Jones (1982) cautioned mentors from becoming too absorbed in attaining their own needs in the relationship however. "Mentoring should come in proper dosages at the proper times, and the protege's needs, not necessarily the mentor's expectations, should determine what those are" (p. 139). To be effective, the mentor, whichever gender, must believe the mentee, whichever gender, is a good risk, and the mentee has to believe the mentor has something valuable to give. Based upon a range of mentee motivations and personalities, Phillips-Jones proceeded to develop a typology of proteges.

The "reluctant" protege prefers to succeed on his/her own and refuses to make a commitment to the mentor. He/she might not be convinced of the mentor's potential success, might be getting special help from another mentor and is reluctant to be unfaithful.

The "inexperienced" protege wants a mentor but is not very skilled in how to carry out a mentor-protege relationship. Success with this type of protege requires the mentor to clearly take the lead and explicitly clarify expectations.

The "overeager" protege idealizes the mentor and is determined to please at all costs. There is a real chance that in an effort to please, the protege may hesitate or refuse to disagree.

The "manipulating" protege knows exactly what he/she wants and is willing to go after it, even if it means taking unfair advantage of the mentor. In most interactions, this protege will only look out for his/her interests and might manipulate knowledge of the mentoring process itself.

The "ideal" protege seems to know his/her own career needs but is willing to consider other options. He/she is willing to learn from anyone who can teach and does so quickly and effectively. This protege values loyalty but is willing to challenge the mentor, and tends to be prompt and reliable.

Adding the dimension of mentee motivation to gender, career stage, work function or academic discipline, mentor motivation and possibly a host of others, this typology seems to underscore even further the question of effective matching of mentors to mentees. While becoming an area of genuine concern for those involved in leading mentoring initiatives, matching of mentor and mentee has yet to receive much research attention. In her study, Phillips-Jones (1982) recommended a nominating procedure, with a coordinator making matches, but whether that is realistic in today's rapidly changing environment is questionable.

In the evolving business culture, characterized by "rightsizing", "flatter" and less bureaucratic organizations, more jagged career paths through several employers, and especially the increased reliance on "contingent" workers, the role of mentoring has begun to undergo dramatic reconceptualization, which may somewhat discount the applicability of previously cited research on mentoring in business for the future, or the focus of this study. In a 1983 study which examined the stages through which a mentoring relationship developed, Kram concluded that the relationship between mentor and mentee changes as organizational circumstances and/or individual changes occur, thus leading to a separation phase of the mentoring relationship. These findings led to an examination of a developing model of support and development, characterized as a function of a relationship between peers, rather than one between a significantly older, more experienced mentor and a novice mentee.

Peer relationships can be delineated along a continuum, from information peer, through collegial peer, to special peer, that can support individual development of successive career stages. The combination of varied functions and types of relationships seems to offer almost all individuals a means for further growth and support at any time in their careers. This potential for meeting a range of needs seems to make peer mentoring a more universally available and dynamic model than conventional mentoring relationships (Kram & Isabella, 1985). As education becomes increasingly more influenced by business methods, this emerging model of mentoring may well become more applicable in that arena.

While mentoring in academic settings is anecdotally accepted as central to the teacher-student paradigm at various levels, "no distinct line of research can be traced with respect to mentoring in academic settings" (Merriam, 1983, p. 169). The limited studies which have been conducted have focused on students, primarily of graduate schools, as well as administrators and faculty, primarily as mentoring impacts career success. While research conducted in 1983 indicated that mentoring in higher education "tended to function as 'good old boy's networks' in which male mentors guide and foster male mentees" (Hall & Sandler, 1983, p. 2), more recent research has indicated the importance of mentoring to career success for all faculty, but especially for members of minority groups and women (Sands, Parsons & Duane, 1991). Academics operate largely through "colleague systems." Standards of behavior in teaching and research are largely determined by unwritten rules handed down from one generation of scholars to the next through informal communications. Senior full-time faculty have typically acted as "gatekeepers" and mentors for newcomers. Success is not merely a function of intellect or talent, but of the ability to be socialized into the profession by these informal tutors (Hill, Bahniuk & Dobos, 1989).

A study of 567 American scientists found that nearly two-thirds of respondents reported having had a mentor, and that a positive relationship existed between the level of self-actualization and having had a mentor (Rawles, 1980). Another 1980 study investigated the relationship between the sex of the mentor and the professional development of women employed in human services. Females who had male mentors made a significantly greater number of positive statements about the mentors' influences on the integration of their feminine and professional self concepts than those with female mentors (Quinn, 1980). Several researchers studied mentoring practices among female administrators in higher education and public schools, which proved inconclusive with respect to whether mentoring is related to obtaining and holding an administrative position (Merriam, 1983).

Of the few studies assessing the impact of mentoring on instructional effectiveness in higher education, almost all focused on the university setting. One investigated the relationship between mentoring and collegial support systems, information adequacy, communication apprehension and faculty success, as defined through self-perceptual and job satisfaction measures, as well as such objective indicators as salary, number of annual refereed publications, number of books authored and faculty ranks. Quite interestingly, teaching effectiveness was not included as an indicator of success, "because of the difficulty in measuring this variable" (Hill, Bahniuk & Dobos, 1989, p. 20). Among the findings were that male faculty without mentors had a higher average score on the success variate than did female faculty with mentors. The researchers concluded that while it appeared that having a mentor was helpful to both genders, being male was even more helpful in terms of achieving high scores on success indicators--an indicator of the disparity in power as well as the paradigms of those participating in the study. One might wonder how quickly that fact might shift, given the overall advancement of women, and the movement into academe of increasing numbers of faculty who were conditioned through experiences in which males and females played more equal power roles.

In their research, Sands, Parson and Doane (1991) found mentorship in a university to be a complex, multi-dimensional activity that can be grouped into four types: the friend; the career guide; the information source; and the intellectual guide. Gender, college of their assignment, tenure status and past mentoring experiences seem to predict the type of mentoring relationship of the four which was viewed as ideal, while marital status, age, rank and parenting status seemed to have no bearing on the type of ideal mentor. They found that 72% of the faculty participants in their study reported having had a mentor, with half reporting that the relationship had occurred while they had been graduate students. Those who reported currently having mentoring relationships stated they averaged 1-3 hours per week in the undertaking. Mentoring between faculty was found to be a voluntary, mutually initiated and agreed upon arrangement, while assigned relationships were rare. They concluded that faculty members who are looking for a mentor should first delineate the type they are seeking, while those who are willing to serve as mentors should clearly acknowledge the type of help they are willing to provide. Planned programs of faculty mentoring should recognize the diverse character of the phenomenon and the need for its sensitive and differential application (Sands et al., 1991).

The only in-depth study discovered which focused on mentoring as an intentional instructional improvement strategy in a community college setting was conducted at Niagara County Community College (Harnish & Wild, 1993). Included were four peer mentoring projects, with three focusing on full-time faculty and only one with adjunct faculty. Among its more interesting findings were that untenured faculty or those distrustful of authority seemed more apt to develop peer mentoring relationships, because peers were perceived as less intimidating and more open-minded. Cross disciplinary teams were found to reduce problems regarding peer competition and fear of negative evaluation, as well as promote a greater understanding and empathy for problems occurring outside one's own department. Peer mentoring projects were low cost, made efficient use of in-house expertise and were easily tailored to an institution's unique culture. Both parties learned from the relationship in a non-punitive relationship that built upon naturally occurring faculty relationships, with an outcome of instructional improvement.

With very limited evaluation, Gappa and Leslie (1993) reported on a mentoring program, entitled "Educators Peer Instructional Consulting" (EPIC), initiated at Cuyahoga Community College in 1988. Averaging 137 adjunct participants yearly, the program rewarded full-time faculty mentors with one-half credit release time for each adjunct they mentored, which they could "bank", until they obtained enough to "cash it in" for their own professional development. The mentor met with a mentee from his/her discipline area three times in the quarter, reviewing the Adjunct Faculty Handbook and syllabus for the courses the mentees taught. In addition, both the mentor and mentee maintained a journal and visited each other's classroom to observe instruction. The mentor's observations were never used in formal evaluation. Richard France, (personal communication, January 17, 1996) Assistant Dean for Evening/Weekend Programs, who was instrumental in the development of the EPIC program, reported that while the program had never undergone a formal evaluation, its anecdotal success was so significant that its funding, originally provided by FIPSE, was now being integrated into the regular instructional budget.

In conclusion, it must be noted that an overwhelming majority of studies of mentoring, whether in business or academe, as a career development or performance effectiveness tool, dealt with mentees who are employed full-time in that endeavor. This study focused on individuals who are employed exclusively part-time as a community college instructors and who most likely will remain as part-time faculty.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to determine the value of a mentoring initiative to a cross-section of 10 instructors, from a broad range of discipline areas, who were new to the adjunct faculty at Indian River Community College. The study was conducted during the Spring 1996 semester, with the researcher, a doctoral candidate in curriculum and instruction and 20-year teaching veteran, serving as the mentor. The mentoring provided emphasized instructional methodology and classroom management concepts and was intended to supplement, not to supplant, the coaching which would typically be provided by the adjunct's discipline-specific key contact person, e.g., a department chair. To gain credibility and license to conduct the study's focus group research, the researcher sought and secured the chairmanship of Indian River's Adjunct Faculty Development Committee.

Research Design

This was a qualitative study with data gathered in a natural setting. Such studies are "useful in presenting basic information about areas of education where little research has been conducted . . . and often form a database for future comparison and theory building" (Merriam, 1988, p. 27). The primary data-gathering vehicle was a series of three interviews conducted by the researcher-mentor with each participant-mentee. Although a predetermined format of questions was used (see Appendix B), the study was largely allowed to emerge with the expressed needs of the participants, to approximate the ideal mentoring relationship (Phillips-Jones, 1982). Interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed. Data were also gathered in spontaneous telephone conversations initiated by either of the two parties in the mentor-mentee relationship, through classroom observations made by the researcher-mentor and other dialogues between the parties, in a variety of settings which emerged during the study. In addition, data were obtained from journals maintained by mentees, which were referenced during scheduled interviews and submitted to the researcher at the end of the study. The researcher made field notes and maintained a journal of his observations and reflections. The research design enabled the researcher to gather, record and analyze both mentee and mentor perspectives in the relationship, in a holistic and natural manner.

Under the auspices of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee, focus groups comprised of adjunct faculty members were conducted. Both pilot study and study participants, as well as some veteran adjunct instructors, served on a total of three focus groups. In addition, all of the college's instructional deans were convened as a group twice, to provide triangulation of the data gathered from the study's other sources.

Pilot Study

Procedures and instruments were tested during a pilot study with 12 adjunct faculty, new to Indian River Community College, conducted during the Fall 1995 semester. The 5 male and 7 female participants ranged in age from 27 to 56. Two were Hispanic, while the remaining 10 were Caucasian. Between them, participants performed their teaching duties in all four of the counties served by the college. Eleven had previous teaching experience in a variety of settings, including military, industry, public schools, proprietary schools and as graduate assistants in universities. Only 2 had taught at another community college. Eleven were teaching at the time for Indian River only, while the other, a resident of Palm Beach County and self-proclaimed "freeway flyer," taught concurrently at a total of four institutions. One of the participants earned a doctorate, another was ABD, 5 had master's degrees, while the remaining 5 had bachelor's degrees. Eight had been students at a community college for at least one course, with 4 having attended Indian River.

Participants in the pilot study were drawn from the following discipline areas: business management, computer science, criminal justice, developmental education, drafting and design technology, economics, history, office systems technology, Spanish and speech. Two taught in more than one discipline. Participants were recruited at an adjunct faculty meeting conducted in August 1995, and through referrals from department chairs.

Employing the Gappa and Leslie (1993) typology, one of the participants was a "career ender," having completed nearly 30 years' teaching in public schools. Five were primarily "specialist, expert or professionals," although 3 of these reported a long-term interest in a teaching career. Three, including the "freeway flyer," were "aspiring academics," while the remaining 3 were "freelancers."

Three scheduled interviews, additional meetings initiated by the participants and telephone conversations initiated by both the researcher and participants, along with rich dialogue in two group meetings of participants, provided the data from the pilot study. A number of suggestions made by participants in the pilot study, as well as researcher-initiated considerations, were incorporated into the procedures of the final study.

Setting

The larger setting for this study was the service area of Indian River Community College, comprised of Indian River, Martin, Okeechobee and Saint Lucie counties in east central Florida. The most current figures put the total population of the service area at 407,000. The college served approximately 45,000 students in 1994 (headcount) from its main campus in Fort Pierce, and satellite campuses in Vero Beach, Stuart, Okeechobee and Port Saint Lucie. A "comprehensive" community college, Indian River offers university parallel degrees (A.A.), career preparatory degrees (A.S.), professional continuing education, vocational credit and personal enrichment courses. Until 1991, Indian River was one of only two institutions of higher education in the service area delivering instruction in its own facilities. Since then, Barry University and Florida Atlantic University, which had for a number of years each offered a limited selection of classes in a variety of rented settings, primarily K-12 schools, acquired their own autonomous quarters.

The full-time faculty of Indian River Community College numbered 165. The best estimate indicated that approximately 475 adjunct faculty members are employed for varying lengths of time during the academic year to deliver a wide range of courses which the college offers and in "centers for personalized instruction" at each campus.

Records maintained on adjunct faculty at Indian River emphasize meeting accreditation criteria and are not integrated into a management information system which permitted other forms of analysis.

Participants

Participants in this study were 10 adjunct faculty members, who began teaching at Indian River during the 1995-1696 academic year. Eight were referred to the researcher by department chairs, while the remaining 2 were recruited while attending an adjunct faculty orientation held at the beginning of the spring semester. A concerted effort was made to achieve a representative sample from the entire adjunct faculty cadre. Among the participants, the following discipline areas were represented: accounting, art, business management, developmental education, emergency medical technology, English, mathematics and psychology. Two adjuncts taught in more than one discipline area. Six of the subjects were male and 4 were female. Among the participants were residents of all four counties of Indian River's service area. Between them, participants taught at all five campuses. Two participants had previous adjunct teaching experience at other community colleges, 1 had taught as a graduate assistant at a Florida public university, and 1 was employed concurrently at a satellite campus of a private university based in South Florida.

Table 1

Study Participants by Gappa and Leslie typology

Participants*	Sex	Age	Previous Mentor	Community College Student
"Specialist, expert or professionals"				
Ben	M	33	work	yes
Carla	F	33	none	no
June	F	33	none	no
Lon	M	45	none	no
Tom	M	53	none	yes
"Aspiring academics"				
Gus	M	32	work, sports	yes
Jo	F	53	none	yes
Sean	M	32	university	no
"Freelancers"				
Ed	M	52	work	yes
Tina	F	49	none	yes

Note. All names are pseudonyms

Instruments

A series of three interview guides (see Appendix B) were used to gather data in personal interviews at the same critical mileposts used in the pilot study--at the beginning, near midterm and at the conclusion of the semester. While the first guide included five closed-ended questions to gather specific demographic data, remaining questions were open-ended, designed to elicit broad-based data addressing the primary and subsidiary questions of the study. Since the researcher was also serving as the mentor, the format of the guides was designed to facilitate the development of an ongoing dialogue.

Drafts for each guide were developed by the researcher and reviewed by an instructional dean and department chair, each highly experienced in working with diverse adjuncts. The guides were then tested during the pilot study. Since the researcher accepted the Phillips-Jones (1982) axiom that mentoring should be driven by the needs of the mentee, occasions arose when time constraints and/or the mentee's state of mind required the researcher to deviate slightly from of the questions included on the guides.

After the pilot study was conducted, modifications made to the first guide included adjusting the order of the questions slightly to provide better continuity. The question regarding previous mentors was moved from the second interview guide to the first interview guide, to encourage the mentee to focus more intensely on the mentor and mentee roles central to the study.

The primary goal of the midterm interview was to encourage the mentee to more deeply contemplate the major issues an effective teacher would likely encounter at that point. After the pilot study, no changes were made in the second guide other than the question regarding a previous mentor. The final question in this midterm interview was designed to encourage the mentee to assume the lead in the dialogue, providing the researcher insight into the progress of the mentee's development.

The guide for the third interview was modified markedly, to provide tighter focus on the study's subsidiary questions. Since the pilot study demonstrated that the third guide contributed to lengthy interviews, which were inconvenient to several participants, the guide was condensed.

In keeping with the strategy of the study, participants were prompted to explore the underlying needs and motivations of their answers. While this action caused the interview to sometimes deviate from the direction provided by the guide, the quality of data gathered was regarded as more valuable than shallow answers to many questions. In several cases, participants provided responses which logically would have been elicited by subsequent guide questions. In those cases, redundant questions were not posed during the interviews.

Additional sources of data were the standard student evaluation forms completed at the close of the semester (see Appendix C). Not wanting to display a judgmental posture, the researcher treated participants' reactions to student evaluations, rather than the forms' actual content, as the more critical aspect of the process.

Finally, each participant in the study was asked to maintain a journal, with the suggestion of entries shortly after each class meeting. The quality and quantity of entries varied markedly between participants.

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected in five ways: individual interviews, telephone and other informal conversations, classroom observations at the option of the participant, journals maintained by both the participant-mentees and the researcher-mentor, and focus groups.

First, an individual, private interview was conducted by the researcher with each participant at three mileposts during the study--at the beginning of the semester, at midterm and immediately after the semester's conclusion. This format was tested in the pilot study and unanimously accepted by its participants as being appropriate upon their completion and evaluation of that study.

In the initial interview, the researcher thoroughly explained the study, providing a one-page printed overview (see Appendix A) to those who had not been exposed to it at the time of their recruitment into the study, as well as copies of the researcher's curriculum vitae and teaching schedule. Using the "Research Agreement" (see Appendix A) as a guide, the researcher then explained expectations of each party in the study. Ample time was provided to clarify points of concern to the participant. The first interview guide (see Appendix B) was then employed to gather baseline information and to build common ground between the researcher-mentor and participant-mentee.

The format of the second interview guide was designed to compare perceptions of the participant at midterm with their expectations at the beginning of the semester. The second guide also sought to assess the emerging nature of the relationship with the key contact person, typically the department chair, as well as the relationship with the mentor. The second interview averaged 40 minutes and concluded with a prompt for the mentor to provide help with some specific issue facing the mentee.

The third interview guide opened with a prompt for the mentees to share reactions to the student evaluations which had been completed at the conclusion of the course they had taught. The researcher reviewed student evaluations only at the direct request of the mentee, concluding that to do otherwise would compromise the nature of the relationship. In several cases where the student evaluations had not progressed through channels to enable review by the mentee, the researcher sought to engage the mentee in a self-evaluation. From that point, the researcher sought to gather data which would help answer the study's primary and five subsidiary questions.

The "Research Agreement" (see Appendix A) indicated that the researcher would make telephone contact with the participant-mentee approximately a week following the initial interview. This time frame was designed to be soon enough to deal effectively with questions which might have emerged following the initial meeting, while delayed sufficiently that the mentee would have had time to engage in active reflection. The mentee was encouraged to telephone the mentor anytime there was a question and provided both the office and home phone numbers of the mentor. The mentor agreed to initiate weekly contact for 2 additional weeks, then biweekly contact thereafter. Notes from each conversation were recorded in a file maintained for each participant, as well as in the mentor-researcher's journal when deemed appropriate.

Classroom observations by the mentor, as well as observations of the mentor's classroom teaching, were also included as an option which could be conducted at the request of the mentee. Also suggested on several occasions to participants in the pilot study, observations were actually requested by only 3 pilot study participants, each of whom was already an effective presenter. Each of those observations were made, with the participant demonstrating a positive reaction to the attention and strong appreciation for the feedback which was provided immediately thereafter. The researcher was encouraged to increase the emphasis on the value of observations to participants in the final study. No pilot study participant accepted the invitation to observe the mentor's classroom teaching. In the final study, four observations of participants' teaching were requested, while 4 participants accepted an invitation to observe the mentor's teaching. Three participants exercised both options.

Participants were asked to maintain a journal of their teaching experiences, reflecting upon the challenges and successes they had experienced. This practice had not been included in the pilot study. The "Research Agreement" (see Appendix A) asked the participant to make a minimum of one entry per week. The researcher suggested that the entry might logically be made within a few hours after each class meeting while perceptions were their freshest. The researcher encouraged participants to bring the journals to scheduled interviews and to reference them during telephone conversations.

Building upon the success of group meetings during the pilot study, focus groups were employed, under the auspices of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee, to collect additional data from the study. Each meeting closely adhered to a 90-minute time frame. Two focus groups were formed from a pool of participants from both the pilot and final studies, as well as veteran adjuncts who had in recent months expressed an interest in the work of the committee.

The first focus group, comprised of 6 males and 6 females, with an apparent age range from late 20s through mid 60s, was convened on Friday, February 9, 1996. The disciplines represented were: agriculture, business, computer science, drafting, nursing, mathematics, nutrition, office systems, social sciences and developmental education. The level of teaching experience ranged from 6 weeks to "many years."

A second, totally different group of 4 female and 5 male participants, with an apparent age range from early 30s through mid 50s, was convened on Thursday, March 14, 1996. The disciplines represented included: business, criminal justice, education, English, mathematics, science, social sciences and developmental education. The level of teaching experience ranged from 6 weeks to "many years." Holding two focus group meetings was designed to lend credibility to the research process and diminish the potential to discount the proceedings of a single group. Each focus group was facilitated by the researcher and one of two committee members of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee who had expressed interest and related experience with the research process. In each case, the agenda began with a summary of some of the work accomplished by the committee over its year of existence, then allowed participants to explore their interests and concerns for slightly over an hour.

In early March, the researcher, through the administrator responsible for adjunct affairs, requested a meeting with the college's division deans, for the purpose of beginning a dialogue on the perspectives shared by the adjuncts in the focus groups. Summaries of the 2 adjunct faculty focus group sessions were forwarded to the deans. On March 18th, the researcher and administrators met to discuss the summaries, and a second meeting was held on April 8th to review the draft of an adjunct orientation checklist which had been suggested in the first meeting.

Members of the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee decided to convene a third focus group meeting, comprised of some of the most participative members of the first two focus groups. The objective of holding the third focus group was to gather additional data while the issues were fresh in participants' minds and to demonstrate that progress was being made. A total of 9 participants, each veterans of one of the two previous focus groups, were invited to the third focus group meeting on April 26, 1996. Several cancelled their attendance at the last moment and the meeting was convened with 4 females and 2 males, with an apparent age range from early 30s through mid 50s. The disciplines represented were: business, computer science, developmental education, English, history, mathematics and science. One participant taught in two disciplines. Each was provided a transcript of both previous focus groups, which served to establish the direction of the meeting. This meeting also lasted 90 minutes.

Data Analysis

The goal of qualitative research is to gather the richest, i.e., wide and diverse, range of data. Therefore, it is by nature often problematic, resisting the notion of standardized procedures. Qualitative research is continually emerging, reflecting a certain epistemology (Lofland & Lofland, 1984). With so little data, either qualitative or quantitative, having been reported on the topic of the impact of mentoring on the effectiveness of adjunct instructors, it was this emergent quality of descriptive research that was allowed to characterize the data analysis of this study.

The three planned interviews with participants were all tape-recorded and transcribed. Since the population was relatively small and there was no desire to generalize from the data gathered in the study, no effort was made to precode any of the questions. Building upon the limited framework in the literature, such as the Gappa and Leslie typology (1993), data were reported in a sequentially evolving profile of each participant. Readers of the research are therefore empowered to identify commonalities with their situations and draw parallels.

> . . . the play of social forces are such that, in the end, it is impossible to predict or even guide consequences with much certainty. The most certain thing you can do is to 'start where you are' and, armed with ethical sensitivity and the discipline of the craft, have faith in what you are doing, irrespective of the presumed consequences. (Lofland & Lofland, 1984, p. 160)

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the value of a mentoring initiative in the development of 10 adjunct faculty members, from a range of disciplines, new at Indian River Community College. One primary question and five subsidiary questions served as a guide for this investigation. Formerly stated, the questions were:

Primary Question

What value will a mentoring initiative offer an adjunct faculty member new at Indian River Community College, above and beyond the traditional relationship with the key contact person?

Subsidiary Questions

1. What degree of structure should be incorporated into the design of the initiative?
2. What are the most significant needs of new adjuncts not presently being addressed by the traditional relationship with a key contact person?

3. What factors affect the degree of needs of new adjuncts?
4. To what degree will new adjuncts avail themselves of the services offered by the mentor?
5. What mentor characteristics, including age, race and gender, contribute to an effective mentor-mentee match?

Data were gathered from five sources: structured, individual interviews at three mileposts during the semester; unstructured telephone conversations initiated by either the mentor or mentee; observations by the mentor of the mentee's classroom performance; journals maintained by both the mentee and mentor; and focus groups comprised of participants, as well as veteran adjuncts.

The analysis of data was performed in a natural, holistic fashion over the course of the study. It is being reported in three ways. First, a profile of each participant, using pseudonyms, seeks to communicate the variety of factors which contributed to the performance of this not uncommon group of Indian River Community College's adjunct instructors, as well as perspectives on the professional growth of each participant during the study. Next, data gathered from the focus groups of adjunct instructors and instructional deans seeks to provide additional perspective and context. Lastly, the development of the mentor will chronicle some of the benchmark events during the study, including those flowing from individual interviews, focus group meetings and other events, and document insights which occurred as a result.

Profiles of the Participants

Ben

A lieutenant in a county fire department, 33-year-old Ben, a Caucasian, "team-taught" a two-semester Paramedic Technology course with the department chair which began during the Fall 1995 semester. Initially, Ben was responsible only for clinical instruction, providing practical applications for the concepts learned in a largely lecture class delivered by the chairperson. Over time however, he began to deliver some of the lectures himself, and his share continued to grow through the spring semester.

Upon graduation from high school, Ben, the son and younger brother of career firefighters, completed the "Basic Firefighter Recruit" course at Indian River. Taught by the future department chair, a "baby boomer" female, it was, he stated, "the most impactful education of his life". Shortly thereafter, Ben was employed by a county fire department and rose steadily through its ranks. Although he continued his own professional education at Indian River and Palm Beach Community Colleges, Ben did not complete a degree program. With his promotions came the requirement to deliver inservice training to the firefighter-paramedics within his unit. In that capacity, he began to interface more frequently with his former teacher, who had become the department chair at Indian River. At that time, he was asked to teach for Indian River in an adjunct capacity and he accepted. His primary motivation to teach was "to share the knowledge he had acquired over the years and to influence the upgrading of skills" which he saw demonstrated in the field (interview, January 10, 1996). In the Gappa and Leslie typology (1993), Ben was a "specialist, expert or professional".

Ben was easily recruited to the study at the January 1996 Adjunct Faculty Meeting. Although he had informal mentors within the fire department, the idea of developing a relationship with someone who could help him refine his teaching skills was especially appealing. During the study, Ben's self-confidence visibly grew as he seemed to increasingly embrace his status as an instructor. He had earlier stated that he had only one effective teacher, a high school literature teacher who made a lasting impression, even though Ben did not see himself then or later as a reader. During the semester, Ben became so motivated about teaching that he requested leave to attend a 2-week, intensive "Firefighting Instructor" course, held at a state university in North Carolina. While there, he excitedly shared his teaching experiences with the retired university professors who delivered the course, and began thinking about pursuing a career as a "coordinator of inservice training" after his ability to perform physically as a firefighter-paramedic was reduced (interview, January 10, 1996).

Through mentoring and the expanded vision it helped him achieve, Ben developed a "much greater sense of accomplishment" from his teaching. He spoke of the students' increased ability to "put the pieces of their instruction together and talk about what they had learned" and to "think on their feet" rather than supply "cook book" responses. He also was able to influence students to begin to view members of their teams with a physical limitation as potentially a great resource, rather than a hindrance (interview, April 12, 1996). Mentoring encouraged him to "think more frequently about how to get a thought across" and speak more often with "other instructors about students' learning styles and teaching situations" (interview, May 8, 1996).

In evaluating the mentoring initiative, Ben thought the six face-to-face contacts during the semester, along with the availability of the mentor via telephone, was sufficient to meet his needs. He recommended more planned observations of his teaching and feedback sessions as follow-up and greater opportunities to observe veteran instructors at work. Ben was interested in becoming a mentor himself, motivated again by "the need to give something back to the profession, the college and the community" from which he had drawn so much. He believed a college-wide mentoring initiative should "include input by instructors who had not had mentors" into its design (interview, May 8, 1996).

At the initial interview, Ben identified the two greatest teaching needs he could achieve more effectively through cross-disciplinary mentoring as "becoming more comfortable delivering presentations and more approachable" to his students. His department chair was "overextended and limited in her ability to provide that type of coaching" (interview, January 10, 1996).

Ben shared that he believed many of his initially-perceived teaching limitations were a function of the "unhealthy teaching-learning environment" he experienced as a student in his "racially-charged high school." He had seldom had effective teaching modeled and was "on the one hand limited by that, but on the other, more motivated because of it to be a better teacher" himself (interview, January 10, 1996). The "feedback provided" through mentoring motivated Ben to identify "needs he didn't realize he had at the beginning of the semester." He talked with his department chair "more frequently about the teaching process and individual student situations." He found he "was talking less, watching and guiding more." He identified the need for "more preparation" and to be "more adaptable to the diverse students he had in class" (interview, April 12, 1996).

In spite of his rotating schedule, significant teaching load and family responsibilities, Ben drove 60 miles round trip to obtain the mentoring offered him. During the semester, Ben initiated three telephone calls to the mentor, seeking two observations of his teaching, as well as a demonstration by the mentor of an experiential learning activity for his students.

Increasingly considering two females--his department chair, and his wife, also an adjunct instructor--as mentors also, Ben perceived gender as no obstacle to building a mentoring relationship. Because of his school experience and the "lack of African-Americans in the fire service," race was identified as being a possible obstacle to building a mentoring relationship. The factors which Ben identified as clearly the most important in his selecting a mentor were their "enthusiasm for teaching, genuine knowledge and humility" (interview, May 8, 1996).

The semester closed with an exhausted mentee--the product of the rotating hours and stress inherent in the firefighting profession--dedicated to continuously finding ways of improving the quality of the training he was providing the area's future emergency services providers.

Carla

The only holder of a doctoral degree in the study, Carla, a 33-year-old Caucasian, was recruited to the study at the January 1996 Adjunct Faculty Meeting. She had taught for Indian River for the first time in the recently concluded fall semester and was scheduled to teach the same course during the spring semester. Subsequently, the course was cancelled for low enrollment, but the department chair told the researcher that he expected to employ Carla to teach the same course in the future. A practicing health care professional, Carla did however teach an upper division course during the spring semester, at the local satellite campus of a South Florida-based university--her first teaching experience at that institution. Her primary motivation to teach was to "enhance her professional standing," but the production of "additional income was significant" as well (interview, January 12, 1996). Under the Gappa and Leslie (1993) typology, Carla was a "specialist, expert or professional."

At her initial interview with the mentor, Carla detailed her desire to become a more effective instructor than she had perceived herself to be at the conclusion of the previous semester. Having applied with the administrator of the satellite campus, she had been called by the university's department chairperson and given details of her teaching assignment. Although a source of discipline-specific help, the chair was "not available for observations or other face-to-face conversations." Carla was "uncomfortable with his official authority to evaluate and influence continued employment from two hours away." She saw the researcher as not only being "more accessible," but also "more collegial" (interview, January 12, 1996).

The questions employed during the initial interview which encouraged her to recall past teachers and learning experiences contributed to Carla's focusing on how she might "bring out the positive characteristics" in herself that she had seen modeled by others. At that time, she wrote that she was "asking for help that she would not normally request" (participant journal, January 16, 1996). She would come to ask for help on an almost weekly basis the remainder of the term. Following each of her face-to-face interviews, she initiated dialogue about issues she was facing which lasted 20 or more minutes.

At the close of the baseline information-gathering interview, held 2 days following the first class meeting of Carla's course, the initial mentoring focused on the logistics of the course as communicated in the syllabus. Carla's plan was to give a "quiz" at the end of every class session. After probing, she admitting not having fully considered "the impact of a 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. time slot" on students who were likely to be "fatigued and frustrated at having to recall material which had been presented to them that same evening" (interview, January 12, 1996).

In spite of the doubts expressed by the mentor, Carla administered her first "quiz," of 50 questions, the following class meeting. It yielded several "very low scores and extensive grumbling by students." As students left class, several suggested a "quiz should have fewer, and more predictable questions." Carla very much wanted her "initial experience with (the university) to be well-received" and hoped that she could "quell the uproar before any students dropped the course" (telephone conversation, January 18, 1996).

She telephoned the mentor the following day. He suggested a spirit of collegiality might be promoted by scheduling quizzes at the beginning of the session following the coverage of the material, rather than during the same class period in which it was presented. He further suggested a non-adversarial atmosphere would enhance the chances of students' success in the course. Carla agreed. The mentor then asked if Carla could afford to allow students to "drop" one or two of the eight quizzes scheduled. She said that "might be workable," then questioned its impact on the few students who were successful on the first quiz. Dialogue helped Carla identify the critical issues. The mentor then explained the impact providing students with "study guides" for exams had on test results. He stated that it was an especially appropriate tool for a course's first exam, in order for students to more effectively predict the types of questions which would be included and therefore enhance their chances of success. Carla implemented the suggested changes, announced them at the following class meeting and reported that all were well-received by students, including those who had done well on the first quiz. She would later make another change in the syllabus relative to the dates when assignments were due that was clearly in the students' best interest (telephone conversation, January 18, 1996).

Halfway through the course, Carla reported feeling "extremely stressed" over some issues internal to the institution. She reported that "having a mentor to bounce situations off reduced her stress markedly and allowed her to put the issues in a more positive context." She also identified commonalities between the needs of adjunct faculty members and part-time students, e.g. "juggling multiple responsibilities" (participant journal, February 6, 1996).

At the mentor's urging, Carla conducted an informal, midterm course evaluation, asking students to anonymously respond in writing to open-ended questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the course to that point, as well as provide their suggestions for improving the course. In her journal, Carla wrote "I needed to hear from them what they were learning and that they liked the class (and me)" (participant journal, February 22, 1996).

During the second half of the course, Carla expressed increased self-confidence, and a concomitant higher level of acceptance and commitment from her students. She dealt successfully with an evaluative observation made by the site administrator and believed that she "delivered especially significant information" to her students in the process (participant journal, March 1, 1996). When she expressed a gender-related negative reaction to comments included in the observation summary, Carla accepted the suggestion of the mentor to read several chapters of a book which might help her understand the administrator's viewpoint. Near the conclusion of the course, she was extended the opportunity by the university to teach another course in the subsequent term.

Since her career largely focused on the development and maintenance of effective relationships, Carla was an especially valuable source of information on mentoring within the academic arena. Carla stated that the relationship with her mentor seemed to move to a new echelon of trust when he contributed counseling at the critical juncture of the first quiz when she "felt extremely vulnerable." She was "provided the tools to develop" her own effective solution. She perceived that the mentor's "familiarity with similar students," his "experience in dealing with a wide range of challenges and non-judgmental method of counseling" were all significant factors in her accessing his help so frequently (interview, April 5, 1996).

June

A governmental administrator, June taught for the first time during the Spring 1996 semester. Although she had conducted a bit of short-term training within her full-time career, June's only previous formal teaching experience was during her bachelor's program when she interned in a fifth grade classroom. Originally from New England, the 33-year-old Caucasian attended a nearly "all-white" high school which employed the "open classroom" concept.

Although she held a master's degree, June had enrolled in a sophomore-level course at Indian River 5 years previously for continuing education credit. During that semester, she spoke extensively with her instructor, who she had previously known from professional associations, about teaching as an adjunct. After several years, during which she changed jobs and got married, June decided to actively pursue adjunct teaching. She was motivated by her "interest in sharing her area of expertise with those who might be encouraged to be more curious about governmental activities," but also sought to explore teaching as a possible long-term career goal (interview, January 11, 1996). Since the former was her stronger consideration, June would be categorized as a "specialist, expert or professional" in Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology.

June initiated a meeting with her future department chair "about a month before the spring semester began." They agreed on the course, she "got the lecture on not discouraging students" and was provided the textbook, syllabus and ancillary materials. She was also informed that adjuncts were sometimes removed from a course at "the last minute" to enable a full-time faculty member to "make their load." Subsequently, she "did little preparation," not wanting to "invest time which might not be rewarded." Since the course began the first day after the conclusion of the holiday vacation, June received final word that her course had "made" several hours before it met the first time (interview, January 11, 1996).

At the first interview with the mentor, several days after the initial meeting of her class, June demonstrated a gregarious and jovial personality--an image she would project throughout the semester. In an introspective moment, she shared that she was "extremely challenged by the 16 week commitment of time"--that her job was extremely demanding and her children put demands on her schedule as well (interview, January 11, 1996). Only at the end of the study would the mentor also discover that June had separated from her husband 6 weeks prior to the beginning of the semester. In the first interview, she also stated that she had not previously had a mentor, other than her father. Although the roles of the mentor and mentee were explained in the "Research Agreement," which she reviewed, signed and received a copy of, June said that she was "reluctant to bring too many problems up" because she had been "conditioned by the business world to hide weaknesses" (interview, January 11, 1996). The mentor sought to clarify the agreement by providing June examples of ways he might help her be successful. The initial session came to an abrupt, but positive, end as June rushed back to work.

To deal with June's expressed concerns, the mentor telephoned her 3 days later and agreed to bring a complete set of videotapes furnished by the publisher of her textbook to her office the following day. He kept that appointment and while in her office sought to establish a deeper rapport by engaging in dialogue about her dynamics of her class. Thereafter, he telephoned her each of the following 4 weeks, usually the day following her class meeting. During the 4th week of the semester, June asked for instructions on using the Scantron machine for scoring examinations and suggestions for analyzing test items. She came to the mentor's office several days later, received the help she had requested, and was also oriented to several instructional support resources, i.e. print shop and secretarial services.

The next sustained dialogue between June and the mentor occurred during the second interview, when among other things June said that a few students on whom she had relied "to feed classroom discussions" had begun to regularly miss class. She said she had "not spoken with her department chair" since their first meeting, and did "not know how to use him or what she should be talking to (the mentor) about." She also said that she was worried that she would "say the wrong thing in class" and "hoped that she did not offend anybody." At the same time, June said she believed that the amount of contact with the mentor "had been sufficient" and that she "felt safe" with him because he was "non-evaluative." She also admitted needing help in communicating more effectively to her students and using audio visual equipment. She went on to say that she "expected to be told such things rather than having to ask for help" (interview, April 12, 1996).

Although June, as documented in her journal, had come to a realization about some apparent teaching deficiencies, she initiated no other contact with the mentor for the remainder of the semester. The mentor called June several additional times, but she, citing time constraints, did not dialogue about concerns in her class. In their final extensive telephone conversation, the mentor detailed the procedures for conducting the student evaluation, which June was to administer at the last regular class meeting.

As they scheduled the final interview, the mentor asked if June would like to review her student evaluations. She said she would. When she arrived for the interview, the researcher stated that he had obtained and reviewed the evaluations, and that "a few were quite critical." He said that such an occurrence was "not uncommon, especially for a first-time instructor." He then left the office for 10 minutes while she reviewed the evaluations.

Of the 17 student evaluation forms, formatted with 9 Likert scale items and a "comments" section, 3 were dominated by marks in the "below average" and "poor" columns. One of those also contained the comment that " (name) should not be teaching." A fourth student evaluation had four of its Likert scale items marked in the "below average" column, the remaining five in the "average" column and a typewritten page-and-a-half letter attached. In a sober and persuasive manner, the letter built the case that the course was a "waste of money" and that the instructor was "unprofessional." Meanwhile, three students marked each Likert scale item "excellent" and made positive comments about the instructor in the "comments" section. The remaining evaluations demonstrated a clustering of responses in the middle three categories of the 5-step scale.

Upon renewal of the interview, June said she was surprised by both the negative and the extremely positive evaluations. She felt that she had done a "credible job," but that there were "clearly a number of areas" in which she needed to improve. She "enjoyed the teaching experience" and would very much "like to teach again," but was concerned that doing so might not be a possibility, given the fact that the negative comments were so strong and that administrators were aware of that fact. June went on to say that she realized that there were "many things involved in teaching" that she did not know how to do, but she had a difficult time asking for help since the department chair and mentor "seemed so busy" with their own work. She realized only at the end of the semester "how many considerations there were to make in teaching" and that she was "not close to having her own teaching style" (interview, May 10, 1996).

June stated she had talked with her department chair only one time during the semester--a call he initiated 2 weeks prior to the end of the semester when he sought to determine her interest in teaching the same course again. She also had not called the mentor, other than to return his call, nor had she established any other coaching relationship. During the semester, she had "learned the hard way how to score essay questions, use the textbook's instructor manual effectively" and to establish appropriate parameters with students. Although June indicated "the amount of mentoring was enough," her lack of success indicated that the suggested structure outlined in the

"Research Agreement," plus two additional personal conferences, both initiated by the mentor, had been insufficient to meet her needs.

In evaluating the mentoring relationship, June stated she "saw both of us as so busy, I didn't feel like I could impose. It would be nice to have a relationship with someone who had taught the course many times before." She went on to say "mentoring should come above a certain foundation level of knowledge which should be taught in a course required of all adjuncts before they teach." She added that she "didn't use the mentor as she should have" and that she was "hesitant to tell" the mentor when she was "having problems," even though she "perceived him as accessible, safe, helpful and non-evaluative." The reluctance June experienced in "bonding" with the mentor had "little, if anything to do with his gender, age or race," but with her own "hesitancy to rely on others" and her lack of previous mentors. At the end of the semester, June said she felt like the mentor "had seen her in the midst of childbirth" and that she had "finally bonded" with him (interview, May 10, 1996).

Lon

An administrator with a municipal government, the 45-year-old, Caucasian Lon taught his first college course during the study. Lon had earned a master's degree from a private, Midwestern university in 1994, only months prior to retiring from a 22-year military career. His previous teaching experience was limited to instructing personnel in the military and teaching Sunday School. Motivated to share his knowledge and to meet a few of the citizens of his adopted city, Lon sought out the adjunct position by talking with the provost at his local Indian River site. Lon fell into Gappa and Leslie's (1993) category of "specialist, expert or professional."

In his first interview, the reserved, soft-spoken Lon shared that he had not previously had a mentor. He had been called about his interest in teaching the course by the department chairperson, who then made the hour-long drive to meet with Lon. Reviewing the course outline and textbook, the veteran department chairman also passed on time-proven procedures for teaching the class. In subsequent telephone calls, the mentor provided Lon with insights into test development and other technical aspects of instruction. Interpersonal dynamics with students was not a subject in which Lon demonstrated interest. In a telephone call immediately following the first exam, the mentor was told matter-of-factly that 4 of the 14 students had failed the first exam and that Lon was "not particularly concerned" (telephone conversation, February 27, 1996).

The midterm session, which would last 90 minutes, opened with Lon sharing that he had little awareness of his development as a teacher. Five students had "dropped the course" and others had "not done as well as expected" on examinations. Lon stated he had little ability to influence the success of students, unless he made homework and examinations "easier"--a strategy which he believed would only result in students' failing to be prepared for the second-level course. Lon "could not recall" if the concepts which his students were having difficulty with were the same ones which had challenged him when he took the course. He said he relied exclusively on "lecture and chalkboard examples" to deliver his instruction. Lon had overheard students make arrangements to study together outside of class, but he "did not actively encourage that." Although he had provided students with his work telephone number, he had received "only two or three" calls, which were all concerning homework assignments. At midterm, Lon had telephone contact with his department chair two additional times--one call initiated by each party. He had not called his mentor, who he conceptualized as "a backup to the department chair." Any questions he had "were answered by the provost or members of the office staff" at the site (interview, April 3, 1996).

At the close of the midterm meeting, the mentor encouraged Lon to try additional methods of instruction, explaining that students who had worked a long day before coming to his evening class might have limited ability to benefit from extended lecture. Lon appeared mildly interested in the potential of other instructional methods and the mentor explained the strategy and tactics of "cooperative learning." At the meeting's conclusion, Lon said he would try cooperative learning during his next class. Afterward, he reported that having "students working in groups summarize sections of the chapter and report their findings" to the others was not well received (telephone conversation April 12, 1996). He returned to lecture and chalkboard use as his exclusive methodology.

By the final session with his mentor, the summer term had begun and Lon was teaching another section of the same course which he had taught in the spring semester. He reported feeling much more comfortable "just from having been through the course once," but had made "no changes" in the number of examinations or nature of assignments. Lon had implemented an in-class exercise contained in the textbook instructor's manual, which was "well received" by his students (interview, May 10, 1996).

In evaluating the mentoring experience, Lon admitted to being "uncomfortable asking others for help." He attributed this to his personality and the conditioning he had received in the military. During the semester, Lon never initiated a call to the mentor and did not maintain a journal. The mentoring he had received had "not encouraged him to think more often about his teaching," but it had, when doing his normal preparation, "encouraged him to consider new methods of delivering his instruction" (interview, May 10, 1996).

Lon stated he "would like his department chair to call every 3 weeks," to keep him "up-to-date on policies and procedures." Since answers to his "questions about policies and procedures were available from the office personnel at the local site, mentoring is not as valuable" as it might be for someone without such support (interview, April 3, 1996).

The act of "having gotten through the course once" was Lon's greatest achievement of his first semester as an instructor. He had "taught himself to utilize the textbook's instructor manual more effectively" and said he was content to solve his own problems (interview, May 10, 1996).

Tom

A government official, the 53-year-old, Caucasian Tom had taught a course 5 years previously at Indian River, when the researcher had been Department Chair and Tom's contact person. Since Tom reported having taught related courses as an adjunct at a community college in his home state for 5 years, little effort was extended at that time to support Tom's teaching, even though Tom had not previously taught the specific course he was assigned. At the conclusion of his initial IRCC teaching assignment, the Department Chair shared with Tom that several students had submitted somewhat critical evaluations of the course. Tom responded that the course was not his preferred teaching assignment and that he had agreed to teach it with the expectation that he could perform adequately and subsequently teach a course which better met his background and interests in the future. Tacitly, the Department Chair decided not to re-employ Tom for the following term. Subsequently, no dialogue was conducted with Tom until several years later.

Several months prior to the beginning of the spring 1996 semester, Tom had communicated through one of his key employees, who was enrolled in one of the researcher's courses, that he would like to teach again. Mindful that Tom had an M.B.A. as well as managerial and entrepreneurial experience, was not given the ideal assignment in his first teaching attempt at Indian River, and was both personable and coachable, the researcher contemplated inviting Tom to teach again. Realizing that Tom supervised a number of employees who might be appropriate students for an early morning course which was struggling for enrollment at a site close to Tom's workplace, the researcher called Tom. The researcher assessed Tom's interest in teaching a section of a course the researcher had taught many times, and discovered it to be "the course which best matched" his experience and interests. The researcher then proposed he and Tom "team-teach" an evening section of the course and that Tom participate in the mentoring initiative, with an eye toward preparing Tom to teach the same course alone in the future. Tom enthusiastically agreed, stating that he believed "team-teaching" was an ideal vehicle for building his instructional skills and learning the Indian River culture. Long a proponent of training for his subordinates, Tom also agreed to influence several of his employees to enroll in the course which was struggling for enrollment under his organization's tuition reimbursement plan (telephone conversation, December 7, 1995).

Upon meeting the following day, the researcher shared with Tom the textbook and a copy of the syllabus for a previous section of the course which they had discussed. They agreed that each would teach half of the sessions of the course and that the researcher would furnish examinations and their study guides, as well as other materials developed specifically for the course. It was also agreed that each would attend class meetings he was not responsible for teaching to provide opportunities for Tom to observe proven teaching methods as well as receive feedback on his teaching. Tom again expressed pleasure with having the opportunity for mentoring through the "team-teaching" arrangement.

Beginning to plan the course syllabus, the mentor first asked Tom to identify conflicts on any of the class meeting dates. Both Tom's and the mentor's conflicts were accommodated in the scheduling plan which was finalized that day. They agreed that both would attend class on the first and last meetings to demonstrate solidarity and continuity to students. Tom and the mentor then reviewed the chapter topics and Tom was encouraged to select those with which he felt most comfortable teaching. The mentor subsequently completed the development of the syllabus which was provided to the students at the first class meeting.

The initial interview for the study revealed that Tom had been a high-school dropout, had always "hated" school and was a "C and D" student. While a drill instructor in the Marine Corps for 10 years, he completed his GED. After discharge, he returned to his hometown and accepted a position as a supervisor in a coal mine. Realizing that formal education was his most effective vehicle to upward mobility with his employer, Tom attended the local community college in the evening. Later, he completed his bachelor's degree at a regional state university. His master's degree, funded by his present employer, was completed through a weekend program offered by a private, Florida-based university. Although he "dreamed about teaching at a small college in North Carolina" after retiring (interview, January 5, 1996), Tom's primary motivation to teach placed him in the "specialist, expert or professional" category of Gappa and Leslie's typology (1993).

The assigned class began with 13 non-traditional students, diverse in age, race, gender, work experience and ability level. At the first meeting, students had dispersed themselves throughout the large classroom. In reviewing the syllabus, there were no negative responses expressed toward the "team-teaching" arrangement, or any other aspect of the course. An "icebreaking" exercise was conducted in which the instructors fully participated. Over time, the students demonstrated little willingness to actively mingle with their peers, although several dyads developed which influenced the dynamics of later class discussions and activities.

The first examination in the course was a milepost event. Although essentially the same examination which had been administered a dozen times before by the mentor, the scores within this group of students demonstrated an especially wide range. While reviewing the exam, several students with low scores openly voiced complaints, one of which was that the two instructors had such different teaching styles that studying had been difficult, in spite of the fact that a study guide had been furnished 2 weeks before the examination was administered. Although the teachers employed a time-tested method for allowing students to "drop" their score on the first examination, the issue of the difference in teaching styles seemed to remain an obstacle for several students.

Tom, who taught the course alone for 3 weeks following the first examination, spoke with the mentor weekly during that period to coordinate progress in the class. When the mentor returned to the class, one of the students who had scored low on the first examination vocalized her concerns to the entire class. The mentor asked her to share those comments with him at break, which she did. Hearing her out, he sought to build goodwill by reaffirming the wealth of "real world" experience which Tom brought to the course. That conversation, along with a higher score on the second examination, seemed to quell her anxiety.

In evaluating the semester's experience, Tom stated the mentor had "helped him learn a great deal about the nature of students," especially indicators of low self-esteem, and "the importance of understanding each student as an individual as early in the course as possible." Tom's varied experiences added a humanistic perspective to the high standards instilled by the Marines. He was understandably reluctant to share his deepest feelings about issues which arose in the team-teaching experience but demonstrated intensity when listening to the mentor. At the end of the course, Tom had felt he had "improved a great deal" in his ability to deliver the course. The widespread use of experiential learning activities, videos which presented concepts in a contemporary context and assignments developed through contracts with students were identified as devices which held potential for the improvement of his teaching. Although he had been exposed to such activities as a student, Tom "didn't know how to effectively integrate them into his teaching." Tom "had a lot of pride, probably instilled by the Marines" which made him want to perform at a level that students would "have good things to say about me" (interview, May 9, 1996).

The "team-teaching" approach provided Tom "a level of structure" which he "really needed in order to become as effective in the classroom" as he desired. "Anything short of that," he said, "was insufficient." Addressing the growing infrequency of his telephone calls to the mentor, Tom, said he was "too swamped at work during the day" and was "reluctant to call at night, because people have a right to their private time" (interview, May 9, 1996).

Tom could "not speculate on the role gender, race and age" would play on his acceptance of a potential mentor. "Clearly," he said "the most important factor which led to our success was our common beliefs about the subject matter" (interview, May 9, 1996).

Immediately following the study's final interview, Tom initiated a discussion of his full-time employment and family life which went far beyond any previous discussions with the mentor. In the process, Tom exhibited a level of trust and friendship which would define an effective mentor relationship.

Gus

One of 2 participants in the study who had graduated from Indian River, 32-year-old, Caucasian, Gus was 1 of 3 who were originally from New England. He had attained an A.A. at Indian River, then his bachelor's degree at a Florida university, while on athletic scholarships. He had also been selected captain of his team in both settings. Following graduation, he returned to New England where he worked in the family insurance firm for 9 years, got married, bought a house and had a son. A year prior to the study, Gus and his wife had moved back to Florida, in hopes of building a career at Indian River and getting close to his wife's family and their former schoolmates. For a year, Gus worked concurrently in three part-time positions at Indian River: teaching developmental courses, serving as an assistant athletic coach and helping to manage the student housing complex. During the Spring 1996 semester, he also began adjunct teaching, when, with the department chairperson, he co-taught four sections, both daytime and evening, of an introductory course, at four different sites. In Gappa and Leslie's typology (1993), Gus was an "aspiring academic."

The mentor met Gus several weeks prior to the beginning of the semester, as he was actively preparing to teach his course. A full-time faculty member had been promoted at the end of the fall semester and it was therefore known that there would be a vacancy on the department's full-time faculty in the Fall 1996 semester. The work experience Gus had accumulated was highly valued by the department chair for its potential in improving the quality of the department's instruction. From his days as a student at Indian River, Gus was also viewed as a leader by many who were still employed at the college. The mentoring Gus received was often discipline-specific. In addition, because he was co-teaching sections of the course with the department chairperson, Gus in effect had two mentors during the study. Gus had a history of being mentored--once by a veteran who acclimated him to the insurance industry and another by the athletic coach who was influential in his moving back to Florida.

In the opening interview, Gus reported having a "strong academic preparation," both in his well-funded public school system and community college experience. Although he had no teaching experience other than a series of insurance seminars he had conducted several years previously, Gus articulated quite clearly an effective understanding of the teaching-learning process. He was "highly motivated to fully participate" in the mentoring initiative because of his desire to "be outstanding at whatever" he did. He admitted having a "great deal to learn about teaching." The invitation for Gus to observe a section of one of the mentor's courses was met with his attending and participating in approximately 15 meetings. On one occasion, he substituted for the mentor and was extremely well-received by the students (interview, January 3, 1996).

At midterm, Gus expressed teaching concerns that one might expect from a veteran adjunct, rather than a newcomer. Although he had experienced "a fair amount of nervousness," he had become "confident in his delivery" and was turning his attention toward "moving unsuccessful students toward greater levels of achievement." In his team-teaching arrangement, Gus was regularly observing the department chairperson's teaching and discussing ways to enhance their "mutual effectiveness," and was also redesigning course materials and methods (interview, March 21, 1996).

In evaluating his performance at the close of the hectic semester, Gus believed it was especially useful for him to teach "multiple sections of the same course, observing how different student populations responded to his instructional methods and materials." He believed he had "begun to develop" his own teaching style, but freely admitted to gleaning many tips from others he observed. He was especially pleased with the rapport he had been able to develop with many students, as evidenced by their inquiry into the courses he might be teaching during the summer term.

Gus believed he derived "great value from the mentoring" initiative. Through observing and participating in such methodologies as cooperative learning, experiential learning and Socratic questioning being employed in the mentor's course, he was able to "build his knowledge base." The experience also gave him "confidence more quickly than if I had to go it alone." He also reported "becoming more analytical of voice inflections, body language and motivational techniques used by the veteran teachers" with whom he interfaced (interview, May 3, 1996).

In addition to the initiative's planned sessions, Gus also maximized the opportunities for receiving extra coaching which his schedule permitted. When observing the mentor's class, Gus served as an extra resource in class discussions and remained after class to clarify his understanding of strategies employed by the mentor. He also sought out opportunities to observe other instructors and to compare and contrast their methods with the mentor. And, he volunteered to substitute for several instructors while they were attending conferences, to experience the dynamics of other courses and student populations.

Developing "my own teaching style, consistent with others in the department but in its own way unique" was the major need Gus expressed (interview, May 3, 1996). In his initial interview, Gus stated he "wants to be great in the classroom, wants positive comments written about his performance and wants to present material in a realistic context" (January 3, 1996). He realized that the department chairperson alone could not provide him with the amount of coaching he would require to attain his expected level of success. A marginal "Gen Xer" himself, Gus believed he had a mandate to improve the performance of younger students. During the semester he believed he had "refined some techniques of more effectively reaching students who are members of that generation, who frequently demonstrate difficulty with traditional teachers." Among those, he cited "helping students in a way which they would not realize help was being provided, using a dry sense of humor and employing their jargon on a regular basis" (interview, May 3, 1996).

At the close of the semester, Gus had applied and interviewed for the vacancy on the full-time faculty. He believed his experience with two teaching mentors had "prepared him well" for performing in the position if he were hired. Among the qualities which he cited as being key to those successful mentoring relationship were his beliefs that he and his mentors "were inclined far more toward practicality than theory, were well disposed to both giving and receiving feedback and were holders of unselfish attitudes toward accomplishment." Gus believed that "whenever possible, adjuncts should be required to make regular observations and/or co-teach a course with a veteran, in order to develop not only a feel for the material within the course but also for the pace at which the material is delivered." He believed that his previous experience as a mentee "made it much more comfortable to work with his mentors" during the study (interview, May 3, 1996).

Jo

A veteran of 9 years of teaching at a New England community college, Jo taught for the first time at Indian River during the Spring 1996 semester. Concurrently, she tutored in the college's Center for Personalized Instruction two mornings per week. Married and Caucasian, the 53-year-old Jo spent about half the year at a recently-built second home in Indian River's service area and the remainder of the year at her permanent home in New England, where she valued visiting her family and maintaining her alliance with the community college.

Upon graduation from high school, Jo attended and graduated from a private junior college. After her children were nearly grown, she returned to college to complete her bachelor's and master's degrees, with the goal of teaching in a high school. While a graduate student, she volunteered in the university's tutoring lab where she developed a love of helping struggling students. She did not enjoy her initial exposure to high school teaching and soon thereafter began tutoring students in her home. At the same time, she volunteered as a mentor for a program which sought to help its welfare recipient clients become independent through pursuing a college education. After a brief time, she began teaching part-time at the local community college and later, concurrently at a nearby state university. At the close of the study, the financially-secure Jo was seeking a full-time teaching position even though her husband demonstrated little support for her doing so. In Gappa and Leslie's (1993) typology, Jo was an "aspiring academic."

Jo had "never had a mentor," and "only one outstanding teacher" in her career as a student--a history professor in junior college. Upon later reflection, the fact that she had previously disliked history seemed to have played a role in sparking her interest to teach another subject with which many students struggle. She first became actively motivated to teach when, as a non-traditional student, she came to the realization that she "could teach more effectively than several professors" she had. She remained motivated by her love of helping struggling students, especially with a subject which so many student loathed (participant journal, March 8, 1996). Teaching had also helped a "shy" Jo "become more comfortable with" herself, a factor she came to realize, she "shared with many of her adjunct friends" (interview, April 4, 1996).

Referred as a possible mentee by her department chair, Jo warmly welcomed the chance to work with the researcher. Their initial meeting occurred immediately following the

Monday morning meeting of Jo's class during the semester's third week. Effective rapport was quickly established and a high measure of openness was attained within 15 minutes.

At the midterm interview, Jo asked the mentor to make a classroom observation, which was subsequently scheduled for the following morning. From that point, Jo demonstrated a high degree of collegiality and commitment to improving her instruction through the mentor's counsel.

In evaluating the mentoring experience at the close of the semester, Jo stated "I've enjoyed your mentoring, because it's given me a chance to talk more openly about my teaching than I've ever done before" and that mentoring has "helped me realize how important teaching truly was in my life" (interview, May 1, 1996).

Addressing the issue of structure, Jo was especially appreciative of the observation of her teaching which she requested of the mentor and wrote in her journal that the written feedback from it was "helpful and taken to heart." She stated that the observation "might have been more useful had it come a few weeks earlier in the semester," to enabling her to "more effectively incorporate the suggestions" into her teaching. The other five meetings were initiated by the mentor, and were "enough" for Jo (interview, May 1, 1996).

Jo emphasized the need for intra-disciplinary coaching, in addition to the cross-disciplinary mentoring provided during the study, citing the fact that she was continuing to struggle with several mathematics concepts which she had great difficulty in learning to teach more effectively. She suggested that the mathematics department develop a method by which instructors, both full-time and adjunct, might observe each other's teaching, to more effectively master key teaching strategies. The major value of cross-disciplinary mentoring Jo wrote was " . . to have someone with whom to discuss areas of concern, knowing you will not be judged" by the formal lines of authority (participant journal, February 27, 1996).

An experienced adjunct at other colleges, Jo identified a need to contribute something to Indian River's effort to reach "struggling students," and to "gather ideas which would allow her to increase her teaching repertoire". At one focus group meeting, she provided participants with copies of an article she had clipped on "discovery learning" and went on to say that adjuncts "needed to share resources more freely". Jo also volunteered to serve as an unpaid "coordinator of adjuncts" at her satellite campus, believing she could answer "90% of the questions which might arise, relieving the department chairs and provost" (focus group, April 26, 1996).

Jo stated that the characteristics of the mentor which most contributed to their building of an effective relationship so quickly were his "openness and willingness to let the relationship take its own course, rather than to mandate a direction". She indicated that although she felt "comfortable" with the mentor "within a few minutes" of their initial interview, she resisted telephoning because she had not previously had a mentor and needed to discover the parameters of such a relationship for herself. Another key factor which contributed to the effective match was the perceived level of experience the mentor had in "dealing with a wide range of instructional and institutional issues". While the mentor's age was not a critical issue, it "contributed to a perception of competence" in Jo's mind. Gender and race were not critical issues, as Jo had "worked well with a diverse faculty" in her previous adjunct positions (interview, May 1, 1996).

The semester ended with Jo asking the mentor for a reference letter for a full-time teaching position at the community college in New England where she had previously taught. In spite of a 40-mile round trip, she attended the social function sponsored by the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee.

Sean

A 32-year-old Caucasian, Sean completed his master's degree at a public Florida university in May 1995. While there, he had taught as a graduate assistant and, during the Fall 1995 semester, as an adjunct. During the Spring 1996 semester, his first at Indian River, Sean taught sections of two fundamental academic courses. Each course met in an 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. time slot on a week night, when students were likely to be highly fatigued. Employed part-time in a service sector position on weekends, Sean hoped to acquire a full-time teaching position at a community college or private liberal arts college for the Fall 1996 semester, and shortly thereafter to begin a doctoral program. Sean met the criteria of Gappa and Leslie's (1993) "aspiring academic" category.

After pursuing adjunct positions at several community colleges, Sean met his Indian River department chair "a month prior to the beginning of the semester" and accepted his offer to teach the two different courses. His decision enabled Sean to relocate to the service area by sharing housing with a good friend, while providing proximity to his long-held weekend job. Sean reported an especially accommodating attitude on the part of his department chair, which made his transition to community college teaching "very smooth." Having never been a student or taught at a community college, Sean had only limited perceptions of its culture and the orientation of the department chair to rely on as he approached delivering his courses. His expectations of having primarily "non-traditionally-aged, fully-employed, highly motivated and disproportionately female students" were realized (interview, January 16, 1996). He was a bit surprised that his students were "less conversational and relatively more enlightened" than he expected.

Sean identified himself as "independent and self-directed," and "not someone who seeks out others for help" (interview, April 4, 1996). At the same time, he admitted to being comfortable with the mentor "within two seconds." Initially, he was inclined to view his role as "more a participant in a study rather than a mentee" (interview, May 9, 1996). Sean indicated that his role perception began to change after a call from the mentor 2 weeks into the study, telling Sean of an upcoming job fair, co-sponsored by Florida's community college system. Sean subsequently attended the function and developed job leads which were being nurtured at the end of the study.

During the study, Sean admitted to having been greatly surprised by his students, who were proving themselves as capable of "doing the same level of work" as he had experienced at the state university. Students were also seeking him out more frequently during office hours and through telephone calls to his home than he expected. He was "disappointed" that his "efforts at achieving a more conversational classroom environment were not well received," and that he reluctantly "had to rely more on lecturing" than he had hoped (interview, May 9, 1996). Maintaining the study's journal was an "especially useful tool" for Sean's "processing the differences and similarities of community college and university students." He admitted however, that journalizing "would probably not have been undertaken had it not been a requirement of the study" (participant journal, January 23, 1996). Among his other realizations stemming from comparisons with his initial expectations were lower student attrition, greater improvement in students' writing skills and the extensive amount of time he was investing in evaluating student work.

Sean participated actively in the second and third focus groups, perceiving the process not only as "a useful way to share an adjunct's viewpoint," but also as a "personal development opportunity." The focus groups were his "only opportunity to interface with other adjuncts," given the late scheduled hours of his courses (interview, May 9, 1996).

In evaluating the mentoring initiative, Sean stated had he not been "encouraged by his department chair," he "would not have volunteered for the mentoring initiative." Having had "a solid mentor as a graduate student," he had become "self-reliant and confident" in his teaching while at the university. During the semester, Sean developed a close relationship with his "very approachable" department chair, meeting him "weekly for at least a few minutes." During that time, Sean not only "obtained answers to institutional questions," but also "coaching in teaching practices." On two occasions, Sean cited his chairperson's "convenient availability" as the "most important factor" in his becoming acclimated to the Indian River environment (interview, May 9, 1996).

One need which went unmet by Sean's otherwise strong relationship with his department chair however was socialization. His meetings with the chairman, though informative, were typically "abrupt," as the department chair was preparing to leave campus at the end of an often hectic work day. The late hour of Sean's classes found no other adjuncts present in his building, and though his dialogue with students was rewarding, it did not provide the "level of professional stimulation" that he desired (participant journal, April 5, 1996). Another strong unmet need was "receiving non-judgmental coaching and information about college policies, procedures and culture," that because of time constraints, were not brought up in his meetings with his department chair.

Sean believed that no demographic characteristics were essential in achieving an effective mentor-mentee match. Only "a strong knowledge base and a passion for the discipline" were critical to his acceptance of a mentor (interview, May 9, 1996).

Ed

A native of Florida's Panhandle, the 52-year-old, Caucasian Ed had been a successful businessman for over 25 years. Following three semesters of college and a 4-year enlistment in the military, Ed began his career delivering 2- and 4-day personal development seminars, traveling the entire United States for 3 years. He then went into partnership and served, for 10 years, as general manager for a chain of retail gift shops in California. Subsequently, Ed was hired by a Midwestern insurance company to develop and manage its training department. While there, he also taught non-credit public speaking courses at a local community college. Upon the downsizing of the company, Ed and his family returned to Florida, establishing residence in the service area of Indian River Community College. While self-employed as a consultant and finishing his associate's degree, Ed met his future mentor. Subsequently, Ed was invited in the Fall 1995 semester to "team-teach" with his mentor a seminar which emphasized the development of students' communications skills.

In January 1996, Ed was assigned half of the spring semester teaching load of a full-time instructor who had been promoted to an administrative position at the end of the fall semester. Besides his teaching load, Ed invested the largest amount of his time in developing his teenage son's potential to earn a college athletic scholarship. In conceptualizing his future career, Ed was considering pursuing a non-teaching position within the college, producing a local television interview program and re-energizing his consulting practice. At the time of the study, Ed was classified as a "freelancer" in the Gappa and Leslie (1993) typology.

In his initial interview for the study, Ed divulged that although he had always been a proponent of higher education, the low economic status of his parents, his historically demanding and transient career and his keen desire to play a major role in the development of his only child had been obstacles to his finishing a college degree. He shared vivid memories of both effective and ineffective teachers. Being careful to indicate that "mentor" denoted someone who had "lifelong impact" on his development, he identified a former military supervisor and colleague in his position with the personal development organization as the only previous persons who satisfied his definition of the term. Currently, he regarded the researcher as his mentor, for having "encouraged and helped him develop into a teacher, rather than a trainer". Ed had come to view training as "superficial," while teaching "maximized an instructor's energy at helping people change on a more fundamental level" (interview, January 4, 1996).

The frequency of interfacing between Ed and his mentor was markedly greater than that with any other participant in the study. They spoke face-to-face at least three times weekly during the spring semester, about specific students they shared, as well as ideas and materials on specific courses which Ed was teaching. Halfway through the semester, Ed and the mentor also "team-taught" a six-session interpersonal skills course for a local utility company.

Ed identified several advantages to both parties involved in a "team-teaching" arrangement involving a veteran and novice. These included the novice being "provided a successful model to emulate, an opportunity to receive coaching on observed teaching and increased confidence from participating in a successful experience." Stating that both parties must benefit in any relationship, Ed identified the rewards to the veteran in the arrangement as being "the opportunity to evaluate the novice to identify strengths which might be used in upgrading the overall program effort and the feedback on his teaching methods, as analyzed from the novice's perspective." Ed believed that it was "critical to allow the novice an ample role in their 'team-teaching' assignment, so that the learner could deliver those concepts which he regarded as strengths." Ed saw "team-teaching" as an effective tool for reducing the "horror stories" of ineffective adjunct teaching (interview, May 13, 1996).

During the semester, Ed was sensitized to the bifurcation of adjunct and full-time community college faculty. He verbalized that "often adjuncts know so little about their course and how it dovetails with the rest of the curriculum, the textbook and other teaching materials and the process of teaching itself that they cannot articulate what they perceive as intelligent questions." Ed believed one of the paramount things which adjuncts needed to understand was "how much of the course content was required and what portions, if any, could receive flexible treatment." In the several courses he had taught, Ed believed it was "impossible to effectively teach everything in the textbook," yet he recalled having believed that it was mandatory to do so (interview, March 6, 1996).

As the study ended, Ed had been "greatly impacted" by his single semester of college teaching, "largely through the insights provided" by the mentor. He had been "greatly influenced by teaching traditionally-aged students," especially those who numerically dominated a daytime course he taught. He initially viewed them as coming to class so they could "check another course off the list," but through dialogue with his mentor and a great deal of reflection, he had come to change his view. He was especially impressed with the non-traditionally-aged students, who "when nurtured, become so eager to learn." He wondered aloud if he would be able to continue his career as an educator (interview, May 13, 1996).

Ed stated the frequency of contact with his mentor was "ideal" and should be "duplicated for every adjunct who could possibly take advantage of it." He believed himself "fully capable of being self-directed in his future teaching." He said "department chairs simply don't have the time to dedicate to adjuncts which they need to perform at the level which students expect and deserve. Questions arise on short notice," he said, "and early in the teaching assignment, must be answered quickly, so that the adjunct maintains momentum." Ed said "having a trusted mentor available to take a call spontaneously or available to see you on a moment's notice to answer a dumb question" was his "greatest need." His other needs were having the parameters for his courses clearly established. An accomplished presenter, Ed also needed help "with the logistics of developing exams," accessing teaching resources and "understanding different learning styles" (interview, May 13, 1996).

Ed's needs were affected by his "lack of college teaching experience and his need to be perceived as more than competent" by his students. Ed also felt "challenged by an environment which expected regular improvement in the quality of performance and in which there was just a little competition to develop a following of students" (interview, May 13, 1996).

Although he and the mentor were of the same gender, race and approximate age, Ed stated those qualities were "clearly not the most important" in their ability to form an effective match. He identified "reflective listening of mentor, similar personalities, common philosophy of teaching and pride in doing a good job" as "the most significant factors" in the success of their relationship (interview, May 13, 1996).

Tina

A 49-year-old Caucasian, Tina had recently moved to the service area from one of Florida's largest cities, where she had completed her Masters degree. She had previous teaching experience in an elementary school and in graduate school, but none at a community college level. Besides her teaching, Tina was involved in marketing some of her own work, and in short, exploring her career options within the area. In Gappa and Leslie's typology, Tina was a "freelancer."

At the time of the initial interview, Tina had met her class twice at an off-campus site. She was surprised to find her students unmotivated to assimilate new ideas, but more invested in working on their individual projects in an especially convenient and well-supplied facility. Many of her students had been taking related courses for number of years at the same site. They often arrived late for class and/or left early. Working within an irregular chain of command, Lou said she "lacked the authority to deal with the students," many of whom were elderly and clearly financially upscale. She felt "dumped into the situation without much help" (interview, February 1, 1996).

The interview was conducted in Tina's studio, which was in reality half of the garage of her home. The interview was interrupted twice by children who wanted their mother's attention as they arrived home from school, and a third time by a telephone call from a friend. Although the interview ended with friendly words, Tina's non-verbal communications sent a mixed message.

Subsequent efforts to reach Tina were unsuccessful. Three messages were left on her answering machine, and although both home and work telephone numbers were provided in the message as well as in the "Research Agreement," none were returned. Tina was not pursued for further involvement in the study.

Perspectives from Focus Groups

In this study, focus groups comprised of two distinct populations were utilized to provide additional perspective into the development of adjunct faculty at Indian River Community College. All meetings were conducted under the auspices of the 1-year old Adjunct Faculty Development Committee. Three focus group meetings comprised of both new and veteran adjunct faculty members were convened. In addition, two focus group meetings comprised of instructional deans were conducted.

The first adjunct faculty focus group meeting was convened on February 9, involving 12 participants from a broad range of discipline areas. Building upon the results of a printed survey which had been administered to IRCC adjuncts a year earlier, the facilitators of the focus group meeting sought first to assess the quality and quantity of information which the attendees had received through official IRCC channels. While comments were heard about adjunct faculty meetings, a recently begun newsletter for adjunct faculty and other matters, one of the issues of concern which emerged was a disparity of information dissemination between the departments represented. One attendee stated:

> I walked into my first day of teaching not having received any kind of orientation or attending any form of meeting. I felt isolated. (Afterwards) I was addressed by my contact person as if he was assuming 'well, any kind of teacher would know what to do in this situation.' After that, I didn't feel very comfortable asking any questions. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

Another stated:

> My department chair provided me with a mentor who had taught the course I was to teach. She shared a lot of her ideas that made it really comfortable for me to teach it. At the same time, I was able to give her some ideas from my perspective, as someone who had worked in the specific field. She had really never worked in this setting and really valued my opinion on course content, etc., while I valued hers on methods of teaching. There needs to

> be something in it for both of us. That's important. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

A third attendee stated:

> A teacher took me under his wing too and that really helped me get off to a good start. We've stayed friends ever since and he's been my major source of information. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

Finally, another attendee stated, "There needs to be a checklist that every department chair follows in orienting the new adjunct" (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996).

The discussion digressed to deal with issues of remuneration for "extra trips for meetings." One attendee stated she felt "like slave labor," while another stated she was not recognized for her efforts to prepare a first-rate class. Several attendees identified small ways in which IRCC might satisfy their needs for modest recognition.

Another attendee identified a critical need which he had, that had recently been addressed:

> As an adjunct, I would really appreciate some kind of evaluation and feedback. I have taught at (satellite campus location), where (provost) used to sit in on your course once or twice a semester. The following week, you'd get a note in your mailbox, telling you about something she had liked about your teaching. She'd ask you in advance if there were any times or days she should stay away from because you were giving an exam or showing a movie, but you never knew exactly when she was coming. That really made you feel more comfortable. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

Toward the end of the session, an attendee who had been rather quiet throughout the meeting stated:

> I'd like to suggest some sort of resource center especially for adjunct faculty which would provide

> how-to books, maybe videos on various teaching techniques. It needs to be staffed at a wide range of times, by someone who is very familiar with the strengths of various faculty members, both full-time and part-time, who could hook the struggling adjunct up with someone who is especially proficient at something the adjunct needs help with. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

Another added:

> There needs to be a web of master teachers or mentors for adjuncts. Mentoring needs to be used more widely too. Those of us who have had some mentoring are probably much better off. There should be an organized web in which new teachers, adjunct or full-time, could be matched with mentors who would provide non-threatening, non-judgmental coaching. (focus group meeting, February 9, 1996)

As the meeting closed, several attendees expressed their praise for the Adjunct Faculty Development Committee conducting the focus group. After one of the facilitators stated that there would be subsequent focus group meetings, an attendee commented that it would be effective to bring together "second-time" participants, rather than mix "new" and "second-time" participants, to avoid "covering the same ground again."

On March 14, 1996, 9 new participants, again from diverse discipline areas, were convened for a second focus group meeting, utilizing the same format as the first. In evaluating the college's communications with adjuncts, one attendee stated:

> I really could use some feedback. No one ever visits my class to let me know how I'm doing. You've got the students evaluations at the end of the semester but that's it. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996)

While another added:

> My contact person pretty much told me "no news is good news'. They don't seem to want to hear from me, that's why they hired me to teach the class rather than someone else who calls with a lot of questions. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996)

A third attendee stated:

> I like (the freedom adjuncts are given), but sometimes you need a little feedback just to reassure you that you're on the right track. I also need to know how what I'm teaching fits into a bigger picture. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996)

In addressing the needs which a mentoring component might provide, one attendee stated:

> Mentoring would be very useful to any adjunct. When you talk to the department chair, you're always uneasy about asking anything that makes you look bad, even when you really need an answer. I'd rather ask someone not in a position to evaluate me, or who has a voice in whether or not I'm hired back to teach the next semester. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996)

Another added:

> It would be really nice to have some central office where you could get some answers almost anytime about general questions that affect adjuncts. Not questions about the course you're teaching, but things like how to use a Scantron machine. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996).

A third stated:

> They might also stock some 'how-to-instruct' books, would be familiar with who some of the most skilled instructors in certain techniques were, could set up observations and maybe some other things like that. (focus group meeting, March 14, 1996).

After the close of the meeting, attendees lingered with each other and the facilitators to discuss points which had been brought out, as well as the overall process of soliciting adjuncts' ideas. As in the first focus group meeting, attendees were generous in their appreciation for the efforts being made.

A meeting of the college's four instructional deans, conducted largely as a focus group, was held on March 18, 1996. Transcripts of the two adjunct faculty focus groups had been provided several days earlier and the meeting opened with the facilitator reviewing the process which had been conducted, then asking for comments. After one dean shared that the transcripts seemed to reflect a "negative tone" and several others expressed similar opinions, another dean stated that there was merit in the idea of developing a checklist for orienting new adjunct instructors. The discussion then moved along quickly and within a half-hour, a draft of the instrument had been prepared. One dean offered to continue to work on the draft and provide the others with a revised copy, which could then be reviewed at a meeting set for April 8.

At the second meeting, deans and facilitators arrived with draft copies of the checklist and proceeded in an efficient way to further refine its format and content. By the conclusion of the 1-hour meeting, a revised draft had been developed and the deans demonstrated a positive reaction to the experience.

From the participants in the two previous adjunct faculty focus groups, 9 were invited to participate in a third focus group meeting held on April 26, 1996. Copies of the transcripts of the first two meetings were distributed and attendees offered a chance to review. Each agreed that the transcripts were complete and accurate. The facilitator opened by asking attendees to share their reflections on the earlier meetings. The first response was "I'd like to know what has been done about the suggestions we made in our first time together."

The researcher explained the process through which the deans had developed the checklist, which he then provided to the attendees for their final review. Several small details were suggested, which were subsequently furnished to the dean finalizing the instrument. The researcher also explained that the adjuncts' expressed need for opportunities to end their sense of isolation had been addressed by developed plans for an end-of-the-year social function.

An attendee immediately responded, "We feel like we're part of something now. We're not out there just dangling" (focus group meeting, April 26, 1996).

Another added, "Just having the focus group meetings and being heard, I've come to feel really appreciated" (focus group meeting, April 26, 1996).

The remainder of the meeting dealt with a cornucopia of adjunct concerns, from pay, parking, security and library procedures to methods of dealing with frequently occurring course management situations. In most cases, attendees reflected to their peers the rationale behind given practices, and those explanations were accepted in a matter-of-fact manner. Clearly, adjuncts were demonstrating their need to be heard, to dialogue on those issues which regularly impact the performance of their duties and to be unconditionally accepted as a professional. One attendee stated succinctly, "Everyone, especially the students, really benefits from having a forum for sharing ideas" (focus group meeting, April 26, 1996).

The Development of the Mentor

The mentor in this study had taught full-time at the high school and community college levels for 20 years. While teaching high school, he instructed a management course as an adjunct at Western Kentucky University and several courses as an adjunct at Indian River Community College for one year prior to joining its full-time faculty. After becoming full-time at Indian River, he served as the Department Chairperson for Business Management, during which time he hired and monitored over 50 adjunct instructors, and in the process established a mentoring relationship with approximately 10 of those. During the pilot study conducted in the Fall 1995 semester, he studied and mentored 12 adjunct instructors from a wide range of discipline areas. At the time of the final study, he had viewed adjunct teaching from several perspectives--as a mentor, mentee, observer of others' mentoring relationships and researcher.

The pilot study offered an extremely wide set of experiences to prepare the mentor for the final study. The initial meeting with each potential participant had many of the dynamics of going on a "blind date" or making "cold" sales calls. The mentor was asking each new adjunct to "take a chance" on exploring a relationship with a person who at best had been recommended by a little-known department chair, or at worst was a spontaneous encounter at a college gathering, i.e. adjunct faculty meeting. Having been in a similar situation a number of times, the mentor was nonetheless not without a degree of anxiety. The mentor had heard from a number of his sales-training sessions, that the key to success was in quickly building "common ground" with the "customer," but also to "be yourself." With each encounter, the mentor became a bit more astute at identifying potential components of "common ground" with potential mentees, and because of positive feedback from previous mentoring experiences, was more confident in making his presentation. Mentoring was a very easy "product" to sell (researcher journal, November 2, 1995).

As stated earlier, the pilot study participants came from a number of developmental, occupational preparation and pre-baccalaureate areas, represented an age range of 26 to 56, were evenly split between males and females and represented all four of Gappa and Leslie's (1993) categories of adjuncts. In addition, the degree of support they received from their department chairs ranged from a half-day's orientation to the course, with tour of campus resources and a nearly 2-hour collegewide adjunct orientation meeting, to a telephone call which said essentially "the course starts in 2 days, stop by the office and pick up the books" (researcher journal, November 6, 1995).

As interactions grew with each of the 12 participants, their widespread dedication to delivering first-rate instruction became evermore clear. Although each participant led a very busy life, fully one half of the 12 actively sought out growth in their teaching efforts, by attending group sessions, requesting observations of their teaching, initiating information-gathering telephone calls and reading articles and books supplied by the mentor. Of the 36 interviews scheduled, only one was cancelled and no participant was ever more than a few minutes late. No one was rewarded materially or guaranteed a teaching job for the following semester. The initiative and commitment of the participants was the antithesis of the rather widely-held stereotype of adjuncts as being overwhelmingly motivated by monetary gain, either through the teaching salary or the opportunity to enhance income in their full-time positions through the networking afforded by teaching (researcher journal, January 10, 1996).

As in any set of interpersonal relationships, there were some participants with whom the mentor grew more close--in this case, 3. While several factors were anticipated as contributing to the building of "common ground," gender was not an issue in these cases, as all 3 were female. While none of the discipline areas directly matched the mentor's, another contributing factor to the establishment of "common ground," each shared a passion for teaching and an open mind toward diverse students and innovative teaching methods. There was a high degree of trust in each relationship, achieved through diverse circumstances. Each of the 3 participated in the final study's focus groups, requested classroom observations of their teaching, regularly verbalized the value they were receiving from mentoring and initiated periodic communications following the conclusion of the pilot study.

Rosemary was a 42-year-old, Caucasian and retired military officer. She had worked with computers extensively and was teaching in that area, as well as in her true field of passion--history. Rosemary had many rich experiences in tours of Europe, which the mentor shared, and sought a full-time teaching position. She had been provided little support in her history assignment and several weeks after the initial interview came to campus to seek out resources--

ancillary materials and a grade book. Unable to access her department chair or anyone else in the department who could provide support, she sought out her mentor. Although he could not provide the discipline-specific ancillary materials, he did provide her a grade book and counsel her through her frustration. From that point, Rosemary demonstrated a strong allegiance to the mentor. He felt at the time, that perhaps adjunct faculty members would be more likely to commit to a mentoring relationship when there was a critical incident from which the mentor provided relief to the mentee. Rosemary shortly thereafter suggested group support meetings which were scheduled by the mentor and well attended by other participants. She would later actively participate in two of the focus groups. In the spring, the mentor called Rosemary, to provide information about a job fair which was being sponsored by Florida's community colleges. Subsequently, she registered and sought out the help of her mentor in refining her resume and preparing to interview prior to attending. Afterwards, Rosemary continued the dialogue, discussing strategy of the job search and later the logistics of pursuing a doctoral degree.

Joan was a 56-year-old Caucasian, employed full-time as a manager at a local health care organization, who taught a late evening Medical Office course. She also participated in the pilot study group meetings, as well as the final study's focus groups. Joan was thoroughly dedicated to continuous self improvement and sought out the mentor to observe her class and provide feedback, which he did. Joan continued to telephone during the spring semester to discuss progress of the study.

Rosa was a 48-year-old native of Cuba, who because neither of her degrees was in foreign languages, was limited to teaching non-credit, conversational Spanish courses to groups of employees from such organizations as fire departments and schools. In spite of the relatively low pay for that category of instruction, she invested many hours in developing learning materials specific to each setting. Facing an especially challenging group, Rosa requested an observation by the mentor which was extensively debriefed the following day. She also provided a great deal of unsolicited written feedback on her perspectives of adjunct teaching.

In short, Rosemary, Joan and Rosa met the test of being "ideal" mentees, as described earlier. The mentor perceived however that they would not have all met that test had he not treated them as equal professionals and/or had he not responded quickly and effectively to their requests for support services. At least 3 other pilot study participants would likely have been "ideal," except for their hectic schedules. The remaining 6 participants were evenly distributed between the "reluctant" and "inexperienced" categories, with none in the "overeager" or "manipulating" categories (Phillips-Jones, 1982).

In summary, the pilot study reinforced the mentor's belief in the value of investing time and energy into the development of adjuncts. He concluded that participants invested more in their teaching and derived greater satisfaction from it when a mentor served as coach and information provider. The only ineffective relationship in the pilot study was with a participant with heavy work and family demands, who apparently perceived the experience as an additional imposition on her time. While the mentor believed he had been effective in helping orient adjuncts from disciplines far-removed from his own, he perceived markedly greater success at imparting teaching methodologies to those whose disciplines were more similar to his. The pilot study also demonstrated the importance of a social component within the mentoring experience, when participants responded very positively to two group meetings at which they shared concerns and information on teaching and classroom management. Perceiving he had been a successful contributor to the development of the adjuncts in the pilot study, the mentor was highly energized to begin a relationship with additional adjuncts (researcher journal, January 2, 1996).

From the pilot study, the researcher identified several methods of possibly improving a mentor's effectiveness.

While it was important to let the mentee drive the direction of each session, it was also important for the mentor to be focused on the nature of the previous discussion. Simply reflecting for a moment on the emotions expressed and reviewing jotted notes provided the mentor with material for posing an opening question or otherwise creating "common ground" when speaking with mentees. With that process came the realization mentors fully engaged in their own teaching and other professional activities should limit himself/herself to mentoring fewer adjuncts. Although mentees might intellectually realize the mentor is a volunteer and has many tasks to juggle, mentees are likely to be slow to forgive a mentor for not making them the complete focus of their attention. Being well organized for each session cannot be overemphasized (researcher journal, January 2, 1996).

Prior to beginning the final study, the mentor developed a "research agreement" which clearly explained the obligations that each party was expected to fulfill. In addition, a one-page overview and resume of the mentor were provided to each participant. These actions, as well as the establishment of a computer file on each participant, made the mentor feel even more organized and confident. Clarifying expectations at the beginning of the semester was viewed as a vehicle for becoming more effective with each participant even more quickly than in the pilot study (researcher journal, January 2, 1996).

Recruiting sufficient mentees for the final study was anticipated as a challenge simply because of a smaller pool of new adjuncts being available. The fall semester typically offers more sections of courses than the spring semester and therefore there is a greater need for adjuncts to "cover" them. In addition, successful adjuncts from the fall semester typically want to teach a course they have prepared and often are offered a second section of the course or a second course. A memo from the researcher to department chairs soliciting participants for the final study yielded the names of nominees for the initiative. In total, the group of participants recruited was somewhat less diverse in terms of its ethnicities and discipline areas than the pilot study group, with 5 (i.e., 2 more than in the pilot study) participants selected from the same instructional division as the mentor's. The mentor had come to believe that common or related discipline was a strong perceived benefit to potential mentees.

Shortly before the first interview was conducted with new participants, the mentor read a section in The Hidden Faculty (Gappa and Leslie, 1993) about an adjunct mentoring program at Cuyahoga Community College--the first such initiative which had come to his attention (researcher journal, January 2, 1996). Subsequently, he spoke with the director of the program who highlighted several years of successful operation. The success of another institution's initiative and the sense of kinship with someone else invested in the potential of mentoring adjunct faculty provided an additional undergirding to the semester of work ahead. Mentors need encouragement, both emotional and intellectual, if they are to effectively serve as encouragers to others (researcher journal, January 17, 1996).

The first interview of the study was with Gus, who, because he was teaching in the Business Management Department, was perceived as an especially rich opportunity. "One day soon," the mentor thought, "this young man could be teaching full-time at Indian River and the mentoring provided could be a major determinant of his later success." The mentor made every effort to be professional, thorough and encouraging, but also relatively quiet. One of the things the mentor learned from conducting the pilot study interviews was to encourage participants to tell what they were willing to share until a clear comfort level had been signalled by a smile, laugh or more accommodating body language. A major purpose of the mentor's questions became to plant "advance organizers" which would serve as stimulants in the mentee's thinking as the semester progressed. A high-strung, competitive "Gen Xer," Gus needed to be guided without realizing it was happening. As the interview progressed, his answers became increasingly contemplative. An effective mentor should first serve the emotional needs of the mentee then, when signalled, begin probing to encourage the mentee's reaching down to conceptualize more grounded responses (researcher journal, January 3, 1996).

The initial interview with Jo was an emotional experience for both parties. Her commitment to students was communicated very passionately, yet humbly. She spoke freely of the struggling mathematics students who had verbalized years of frustration and failure in that subject, and of the nontraditional students with personal challenges who had "pulled themselves up by their bootstraps." Reading later in her journal that Jo had never spoken so openly about her love of teaching, the mentor realized that perhaps he was getting close to the ideal mentoring relationship (researcher journal, February 5, 1996).

The mentor came to conclude that effective mentoring involved caring for someone in a truly loving way, putting both parties at risk when either pushes the line of intimacy. Anecdotally, the mentor had heard stories of professors who had walked and crossed over that line with graduate students. But to walk that line knowing and staying focused on giving and receiving help aimed at becoming a more inspired and effective teacher is an intoxicant which provides no hangover. The mentor experienced that spirit not only with Jo, but also with Sean, Ben and Ed. Their totally unconditional concern for their students assimilating not only the information of the course, but more significantly, the soulful aspects of their disciplines, were vicariously experienced by the mentor. Many adjuncts no doubt are drawn to teaching initially for that reason but never attain that level of effectiveness because they are not guided to develop basic pedagogical tools. A mentor is an especially effective vehicle for influencing that type of development, much as the best parents nurture self-reliance in their children which lasts a lifetime. To that end, the mentor did not seek to always give "the answer." Some mentees are somewhat impatient toward that sort of treatment, but the more mature seemed to embrace it. The mentor became energized to provide a perspective through which the mentee would be more likely to discover his/her own answers. After all, the goal of the mentor should be to increasingly move toward weaning the mentee from their help, encouraging the mentee to become a self-directed learner, and someday observe the mentee become a mentor of others.

Requests from mentees who were inexperienced adjuncts often came at the least opportune times, but it was critical not to demonstrate any inconvenience less mentees perceive less than wholehearted support. Mentees needed help developing examinations, making decisions about wayward students and evaluating projects at the same time the mentor was doing the same things. It became manifest that the mentor was widely available, and that therefore all telephone numbers and non-working hours were made liberally accessible. Even more important, it seemed, was to anticipate those types of occurrences. Obtaining a syllabus of the course the adjunct taught and identifying times, places and telephone numbers where they were available was identified as a request to be made by an effective mentor at their first meeting. Participants in the pilot study proposed that an appropriate amount of structure was for the mentor to conduct three face-to-face meetings during the semester, initiate telephone contact weekly for the first 3 or 4 weeks of the semester, then biweekly thereafter. That structure was identified as being appropriate by the participants in the study, but the mentor came to realize he needed to communicate more "prompts" to mentees--suggesting observations, asking probing questions about the direction of their teaching and encouraging their calls (researcher journal, February 11, 1996).

While one participant was lost from the study, one other was somewhat frustrating. Interviewing the participant required an hour-and-a-half's driving time, as well as the hour session. Telephone calls were all initiated by the mentor and often received tersely. The participant never made a true commitment to the relationship. While the mentee volunteered for the initiative, encouragement to participate from his department chair may well have created the perception that he did not have a completely free choice. The mentor recognized that both parties in a mentoring relationship expect a return which he/she perceives as appropriate to their input. Under a normal situation, the mentor would have terminated the relationship, as any mentor should be empowered to do when the mentee fails to be responsive (researcher journal, May 12, 1996).

June was an especially enlightening participant, for she was perceived by the mentor as fitting a frequent adjunct model, i.e. an underprepared, busy professional thrust into teaching on short notice. While the mentor recognized her challenges at their initial session and sought to provide additional support by visiting her office several days later, he was not able to help her overcome her initial lack of preparation. June provided evidence of marked disparity between her initial expectations of her own capabilities as an instructor and the reality achieved. Having counseled other adjuncts who had received critical student evaluations, the mentor wondered, at the semester's end, if more frequent face-to-face contact and perhaps for diagnostic questioning might have salvaged the situation. Clearly, June's expressed need for completing a "methods course" prior to teaching would have been a more efficient and effective strategy.

A cross-disciplinary mentor needs to be especially careful in communicating his/her efforts with those in the formal chain of command, less the suggestion be perceived that the mentee's official relationship is flawed. To their credit, the divisional deans overcame any such feelings they may have initially had when they so quickly set about developing a means for dealing with some of the problems adjuncts identified during the focus groups. On a personal level, the mentor perceived the effort invested in the improvement of the process of developing adjunct faculty had been validated by the deans' drafting a checklist to be utilized in the orientation of each new adjunct. Mentoring would be an especially rewarding experience when conducted within a true "learning organization" (researcher journal, April 9, 1996).

The social needs of adjuncts observed in the group meetings of the pilot study manifested themselves again in the final study. The focus group meetings clearly demonstrated a quick comraderie between adjuncts who had been perfect strangers when they arrived. At the final focus group meeting, 1 participant asked about the progress which had been made in adjunct relations. When the researcher cited several measures which were widely perceived as significant, the efficacy of the entire effort was affirmed. The kinship which developed during that meeting reminded the mentor of the veterans who gather at a war memorial, perfect strangers, except for the challenges they had once endured, who quickly became close friends, at least for an hour. The observation led to the development of Indian River's first effort to significantly recognize the contributions of adjuncts--an after-work, informal reception at a nearby fraternal organization clubhouse. Nearly 10% of the adjuncts employed during the academic year attended and universally raved about the attention they received. The mentor recognized that one-on-one contact was certainly valuable, but that there was a strong need that could only be met by joining with a number of people who shared common ground (researcher journal, May 4, 1996).

At the conclusion of the semester, the mentor recognized that clearly 4 months is insufficient time to fully acclimate an adjunct to the institution and its culture, much less to prepare him/her with adequate teaching skills. Mentoring offers little chance of success unless a minimal foundation of basic teaching skills exists. When used properly, with an adjunct prepared and committed to taking full advantage of it, mentoring offers an especially strong benefit to both parties in the relationship (researcher journal, May 12, 1996).

Summary

The study employed a variety of dynamic processes to find answers to questions which are fundamental to improving the way one community college helps prepare its adjunct faculty to deliver high quality instruction. While these answers may well differ from those of another community college, whose adjunct faculty fits a far different demographic or psychographic profile or whose leadership has articulated a far different vision and influenced the development of a markedly different culture, the answers to those questions for Indian River Community College have become more clear.

In evaluating the overall value of a mentoring initiative above and beyond the traditional relationship with a "key contact person," the study found that 6 of the 10 participants--Jo, Ben, Gus, Carla, Ed and Tom--indicated that mentoring provided them meaningful insight into more effectively delivering the courses to which they had been assigned. Only 1 of these, Gus, who was involved in a team-teaching arrangement and had in effect two mentors, was a totally-new instructor. Three participants--Don, a veteran of university teaching, and June and Lon, both totally-new to teaching, derived modest value from their mentoring, while 1 participant dropped out and apparently derived no value. These results suggested that the mentoring provided was most effective for adjunct faculty members who had some measure of previous teaching experience. Analyzing the data for answers to the subsidiary questions provided additional insight.

The study sought to identify an effective degree of structure which should be incorporated into a mentoring initiative involving adjunct faculty at Indian River Community College. While a meeting frequency and telephone contact schedule between mentors and mentees was suggested and unanimously accepted, that regimen, in reality, provided sufficient structure for only 2 participants--Jo and Sean--who each had extensive teaching experience at other institutions. The 3 participants who participated in "team-teaching" experiences--Gus, Ed and Tom--clearly derived especially significant value from the mentoring provided. While it is no doubt impossible to "team-teach" with every new adjunct, department chairpersons would see a marked improvement in the performance of their new adjuncts if their development plans approached the frequency of contact which "team-teaching" provided.

Besides face-to-face and telephone discussions, other planned activities proved to contribute to an effective structure. Group meetings of adjuncts at about the 5th and 10th week of the semester were well-received and highly productive. At the conclusion of the semester, a social function involving both full-time and adjunct faculty was universally evaluated as a positive growth opportunity by members of both populations. Observation and debriefing of the mentor's teaching was a highly useful experience for the participants in "team-teaching" arrangements. The activity from which 4 participants derived great value--an observation of their teaching by the mentor--was more frequently sought than in the pilot study, largely because of more frequent prompting by the mentor.

Participants in the study had, as students, been exposed to very little effective teaching and only one half had previously had a mentor. One participant shared "perhaps adjuncts are embarrassed because they have watched teaching in so many settings for so many years that they feel they should have more insight" (interview, Jo, May 1, 1996). The potential for embarrassment was perhaps exacerbated when the adjunct's only contact person was a department chair or administrator who was perceived by the adjunct as judgmental and who held the power to discontinue employment. The fear of embarrassment and the degree to which humans will go to protect their ideal images of themselves has long been known (Maslow, 1987). June most clearly demonstrated this dynamic, but others, especially totally new adjuncts, no doubt experienced it as well. Nearly universally, participants communicated they did not need much help with developing the syllabus or understanding the course content, but did need more feedback on their teaching performance.

They also needed help with a wide range of other issues, which will be addressed in the final chapter.

The study found that the degree of the needs which participants expressed was largely influenced by the following factors:

1. the perceived expectations of their own former teachers;
2. the amount of previous formal teaching experience;
3. their previously having a mentor who impacted them;
4. the quality of the overview they had been provided to the teaching assignment;
5. the availability of a trusted person from the discipline area to answer questions; and,
6. the amount of preparation they had invested prior to their course beginning.

The study sought to identify the degree to which participants would avail themselves of the mentoring offered by the researcher. Seven participants--Jo, Ben, Sean, Gus, Carla, Ed and Tom--solicited help from the mentor above and beyond the minimum suggestion, ranging from 2 telephone calls by Sean, to over 50 contacts, both telephone and face-to-face, initiated by Ed. Two participants--Lon and June--did not initiate contact with the mentor during the study, other than to return his telephone calls. Neither had previously had a mentor or any formal teaching experience.

The study also sought to identify characteristics of the mentor, which contributed to an effective mentor-mentee match. Neither age nor gender difference between the mentor and mentees seemed to play a significant role in the development of relationships which provided meaningful reward to the mentee. The mentor characteristics which did seem to impact the quality of those relationship were:

1. an ability to establish "common ground" in the initial interview on the basis of philosophy of teaching, similarity of discipline and affirmation potential contribution of the adjunct to the college mission;
2. perceived warmth, to include unconditional listening, demonstrated at the initial interview;
3. perceived level of competency in broad pedagogical skills;
4. perceived degree of willingness of the mentor to extend himself, e.g. return phone calls promptly, visit/observe classroom performance.

A final factor which contributed to solidifying relationships, in both the pilot and final studies, was the ability of the mentor to help the mentee solve a problem which was perceived by the mentee as being outside the parameters of the "Research Agreement." Several of these, including providing support which would have logically come from the department chair and information on a teaching job fair, have been previously cited. Successful mentoring is clearly a function of factors which can be studied and intellectually analyzed, but of others which a researcher can only sense.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research indicated that the use of adjunct faculty in community colleges has increased steadily over the past 20 years, and widespread expectations are that the trend will continue well into the future. With the growing mandate for community colleges to demonstrate accountability for their outcomes, each institution is challenged to take significant steps to improve the effective utilization and integration of all of its faculty, including adjuncts. While a wide range of practices offer significant potential for influencing the overall improvement of adjunct instruction, mentoring is viewed as being especially useful in inducting and retaining new teachers, revitalizing and rewarding experienced teachers, and increasing professional efficacy (Roueche et al., 1995).

The limited research data on mentoring as a developmental tool typically focused on situations where the mentee is a new full-time employee in the corporate world or academe, or is a graduate student. This study demonstrated that the dynamics of mentoring part-time academics, with their diverse levels of preparation, expectations of the assignment, differences in motivation to teach and a host of other factors, are sufficiently unique to warrant extensive examination and analysis.

Conclusions

While each participant in the study was assigned a "key contact person", typically a department chair, the degree of support varied greatly. In each case, those relationships lacked the frequency and/or quality of contact to sufficiently meet the full-range of needs of the study's participants. Busy with their own teaching loads and extensive administrative duties, department chairs generally initiated little communications with the participants during the semester. In return, participants typically perceived a lack of availability to the chair, and frequently perceived a judgmental quality in the chair's infrequent and hurried communications.

Support and coaching from a mentor, generally perceived as non-authoritarian and genuinely invested in the success of the adjunct, was of great value to 6 of 10 participants, and of some value to 3 others. That value may well have been further enhanced had the mentor not demonstrated the added dimension of researcher, complete with prepared questions and tape recorder.

In spite of the unanimous declared acceptance of the suggested structure of three meetings and ready telephone availability voiced at the beginning of the study, that regimen was only moderately effective for most participants. Participants needed help when unpredicted situations arose but initially voiced some confusion between the role of the department chair and the mentor. While department chairs were each informed of the mentor's goals and procedures, a larger measure of coordination between the two would have benefitted all parties. Mentors clearly need to initiate extensive communications at the beginning of the relationship with the mentee, especially immediately following the initial face-to-face meeting. Such a conversation would serve to confirm the parameters of the relationship and provide answers to questions which would logically have arisen since the meeting. Additionally, the mentor should more frequently remind the mentee, often totally unfamiliar with the academic culture, of the value of classroom observations and other learning resources which might be available. While a committed mentor might perceive he/she were too proactive, no participant in the study said or otherwise indicated that the mentor was initiating too much communications.

In analyzing the needs of the adjuncts in the study, Abraham Maslow's classic theory of motivation provided an effective tool for structuring and understanding the needs of the study's adjuncts. Maslow theorized that human motivation can only be understood holistically, from a positive perspective. The study's participants all led extremely full lives, and their motivation to teach must be understood within that context. Humans are also, Maslow theorized, motivated internally by predictable needs, arranged in a hierarchy, from physiological, through safety, social, esteem and self actualization. Each human is motivated, at any particular point in time, by his lowest level of unsatisfied need. The healthiest and most productive humans have had their lowest levels consistently satisfied and are therefore most frequently motivated by unsatisfied esteem and self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1987). Participants in the study had their physiological, safety and social needs largely satisfied through their normal daily lifestyles and were initially attracted to adjunct teaching by unsatisfied esteem and self actualization needs. However, once they were assigned a class, an unfamiliar and somewhat threatening environment was perceived and some of their lower level needs emerged as needing satisfaction.

At the beginning of the study, the three totally novice instructors, as well as the somewhat experienced participant who subsequently dropped out, were primarily motivated by their safety needs, as manifested by their common concern about being perceived as competent by their students, their uneasiness with making presentations and their demonstrated unfamiliarity with a system perceived as confusing, judgmental and unforgiving. Novice adjuncts can be helped to build their perceived competency through prompted anticipation of the challenges they are likely to face, and through liberal feedback on activities they have dedicated emotional energy to prepare. Safety needs remained a major concern of 2 participants throughout the study, while 1 novice participant was involved in a "team-teaching" arrangement with his department chair which allowed him to satisfy his safety needs early in the study.

Two participants, both with very modest prior teaching experience, were initially largely motivated by their social needs. Clearly important to both of them was that their students accept and appreciate them as persons with extensive knowledge of the subject matter and humanistic characteristics. At some point during the study, all participants demonstrated unsatisfied social needs, approximating in some cases the feelings of isolation so often reported by adjuncts in the literature (Gappa & Leslie, 1993).

The remaining 4 participants, each with prior teaching experience which he/she regarded as significant, initially demonstrated signs of being motivated largely by their esteem needs. By midterm, these four could each articulate aspects of an emerging "teaching style." By the study's end, two were demonstrating consistent signs of being motivated by their self-actualization needs, by discussing conceptual and philosophical aspects of education and by addressing their own strengths and weaknesses in a proactive, realistic manner.

With Maslow's theory as a framework, the effective mentor would be well served to continually assess the level of needs satisfaction at which the adjunct-mentee is operating. Only then might he/she influence the appropriate context in which that need is likely to be satisfied. The mentor's goal should be to help the mentee move at a comfortable pace toward self-actualization, where the adjunct instructor is feeling best about himself or herself and creating the healthiest teaching-learning environment for students. The mentor must remain mindful that obstacles to that desired growth are frequently implanted by the challenges of the mentee's everyday life--full-time career, family, finances, health, etc.--and that it is the mentor's role to provide support and facilitate reflection, if those challenges are to be overcome. As much as possible, the mentor should identify the degree of personal disclosure with which he/she feels comfortable, so that when sensitive issues arise, they do not serve as an obstacle to growth in the relationship.

The effective mentor of adjunct community college faculty should be careful not to assume that the mentee has significant understanding of the teaching learning process or the policies and procedures of the community college, until such mastery is clearly demonstrated. Generally, mentees are reluctant to disclose their weaknesses, especially early in a mentoring relationship. An effective mentor should employ non-threatening questioning techniques and provide a great deal of reassurance in an effort to discover the nature and depth of the mentees' needs. The mentor should be prepared with resources--brief, practical reading materials and video presentations--which can be furnished to mentees to help them overcome their perceived shortcomings and facilitate the building of their knowledge base. The mentees should also establish a relationship with other instructors, both full-time and adjunct, who possess critical skills and a willingness to model them through classroom demonstration or discuss them personally. The effective mentor will also allow the adjunct to begin to contribute their professional expertise to the building of a mutual beneficial relationship. Mentees will generally be more likely to ask for additional help, when they feel expertise is being reciprocated to the mentor.

The participants operating at the higher levels of Maslow's needs hierarchy availed themselves more often of the mentor than participants operating at the lower levels. Conversely, the novice, and often struggling, adjunct was especially reluctant to ask for help. The effective mentor of adjuncts will coordinate regularly with the "key contact person" to ensure that the appropriate priorities are being emphasized, while being careful to protect the mentee from probing inquiries which are likely to occur. The effective mentor should encourage both the mentee and the "key contact person" to perceive their's as the relationship most critical to the adjunct's success, and regularly encourage their frequent and substantial communications focused on the course content, departmental procedures and other "official" concerns. The mentee is likely to be somewhat unclear about the difference in roles played by the mentor and department chair, while the department chair might see the mentor as a tool for freeing him/her to redirect energy at other needs. At several points therefore, the mentor should emphasize to both parties that his/her role is not to supplant contributions of the department chair, but to provide additional support to the mentee's success.

Gender, evidently, did not play a significant role in the quality of the mentoring relationship which developed during the study. Since all participants in the study were Caucasian, the role of race could not be evaluated. Although 3 participants were older than the mentor, the age difference played no significant role in the maturation of those relationships. In short, it was not so much who the mentor was which impacted the relationship, but what the mentor did. Those things which were identified as playing a significant role in the quality of the relationships which emerged were the demonstration of unconditional positive regard for the mentee, expressed empathy for challenging situations, effective listening skills and the ability to facilitate the mentee's reflecting upon their experiences.

While its personalized nature makes it perhaps the most effective method of developing adjunct faculty, mentoring should not be allowed to become the only means a community college employs. This study has confirmed the importance of providing novice adjuncts with a knowledge base, through a highly structured process, enabling the adjunct to assimilate additional elements, including personalized mentoring. A means of self-directed learning should be provided as well, contributing to the development of the "whole person" (Candy, 1991).

For too long, many administrators of community colleges have perceived adjunct faculty as a cost-saving means to deliver courses which full-time faculty were unable or unwilling to teach (Roueche, et al., 1995). A growing number of community college leaders are beginning to see the need to make a dramatic paradigm shift in the way the institution delivers its mission. Whether they embrace the term "total quality management" or quietly reconceptualize themselves in another business-oriented approach, these leaders realize rethinking the way community colleges utilize adjunct faculty members is an essential component of the shift (Cross, 1994). Participants in the Consortium for Community College Development's First Annual Critical Issues

Think Tank, which met in February, 1996, identified new visions of community colleges as flexible institutions with many of the same characteristics which executives in the private sector have identified as critical to the success of their organizations. These factors include "just-in-time" principles where courses and services can change rapidly, partnering with outside organizations to deliver courses and increased reliance on "contingency staffing" arrangements (Kent, 1996).

This study found a majority of its participants to be far more than "fill-ins" for full-time faculty members. They were valuable contributors in the classroom, dedicated to improving the quality of their instruction and classroom management skills, but were also ambassadors and missionaries to the community. When they improved their classroom effectiveness, they also enhanced their performance in their full-time jobs, in their community service roles and within their family and friendship circles. The time and energy of the mentor were not solely resources in a faculty development activity, but an investment in the growth of the community.

Recommendations

The culture of Indian River Community College should embrace the conclusions of this study, most critically the overall value of adjunct faculty to the achievement of its mission. The culture should recognize that developmental efforts not only contribute to an overall increase in the quality of instruction, but also help the college identify and serve the diverse and changing needs of the citizens of its service area. Future-minded "organizational development" experts have largely embraced the concept of "learning organizations", which value personal mastery, shared vision, team learning and systems thinking (Senge, 1990). Adjunct faculty who are better teachers in the classroom are likely to be better teachers at home and at work, and are likely to encourage those with whom they regularly interface to pursue their own continuous learning, including formal education at the college. Adjunct faculty who have developed mentor relationships within the college are more likely to identify linkages between the college and organizations, both business and civic, in which the adjunct holds a stake, establishing partnerships for addressing common concerns. Strong adjunct faculty are more likely to become contributors to the college in helping it redefine its role, as technology, the demand for increased accountability and other factors impact the college's ability to adapt to a continually changing environment.

A more comprehensive development program for adjunct faculty, with a mentoring component at its core, should be implemented on a limited basis, as quickly as feasible. The scope of the initiative should be limited to one division of the college, with the goal of increasing its scope should it prove successful. Department chairs, and others who regularly serve as "key contact persons", should be involved in its design. Clear goals and objectives for the initiative should be articulated, and at the end of the academic year, the initiative extensively evaluated upon that basis. Among the goals might be the reduction in the number of adjuncts who are failures in their initial teaching assignments, increased retention rate of successful adjuncts, and improvement in the average student evaluation scores of adjunct faculty. Focus groups, comprised of students likely to have been regularly taught by adjunct instructors, should be conducted to provide a qualitative perspective. Focus groups, comprised of adjunct faculty who have participated in the developmental program, should be convened and their insights compared with those of participants in this study's focus groups to gauge progress.

The role of the department chair in the development of an adjunct faculty development program is critical, for no effort is likely to be successful without their genuine support (Roueche, et al., 1995). Department chairs should be provided on-going training in contemporary leadership practices, with the installation of a systems approach within each division being a 1-year goal. The "situational theory" of leadership, a contemporary, humanistic approach to achieving organizational success, developed by Paul

Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1982), would seem to offer the culture an appropriate, practical leadership model. It emphasized that new, inexperienced employees initially require a high task orientation, which the department chair is best equipped to provide. After an appropriate level of task mastery is demonstrated, the adjunct would become a candidate for the balanced interpersonal-task orientation which is the strength of an effective mentoring component. After task mastery and socialization takes place, the veteran adjunct is equipped to be largely self-directed, freeing the department chair's time to provide task mastery training to a new group of adjuncts. The mentor relationship would continue to provide the adjunct with informal, non-judgmental support for as long as he/she perceives a need.

An appropriate task orientation would begin with the department chair's reviewing with each new adjunct the "adjunct orientation checklist" (Appendix D) developed by the division deans, as a function of this study. The effective implementation of such a tool would provide a critical foundation of knowledge for the new adjunct and would perhaps dispel some "grapevine" information and conjecture which fills the void when there is a shortage of factual information. Each adjunct would then complete a 15 clock hour methods course, "Instructor Effectiveness Training" (Appendix E), developed with the input of

163

department chairs and taught by the division dean. Such content delivered in the first month of the teaching assignment, along with the amount of interfacing with the official supervisors which new adjuncts would receive would markedly improve the typical fragmented system previously employed.

A pool of mentors, both full-time and experienced adjunct faculty members, should be recruited and selected, based upon their demonstrated commitment to the community college mission, their demonstrated knowledge of teaching skills and their demonstrated willingness to provide unconditional positive regard for adult learners. Mentors should be vigorously trained and provided a ready resource to access in their efforts to become more effective at their task. Mentors should also be rewarded in their efforts, through a public recognition opportunity, consideration on their annual performance evaluations and informal feedback from their supervisors. New adjuncts would be apprised of the opportunity for mentoring through an announcement at the conclusion of the methods class, when many could logically be weaned from the highly structured relationship with the department chair. Adjuncts voluntarily seeking mentors would be matched to mentors in a session involving department chairs and the division dean.

Mentoring should thus serve as the centerpiece of the adjunct development effort, providing the personal linkage an otherwise isolated adjunct might perceive. Keeping such an initiative as informal as possible, e.g., avoiding the use of the phrase "mentor program", and driven by the needs of the adjunct would seem to provide the best long-term possibility for enhancing the development of a true "learning organization." At the same time, such an initiative would require some level of promotion through the formalized communications vehicles of the college to ensure continuous recruitment of mentors and maximum utilization by mentees.

Informal social functions should be implemented, in which adjuncts could freely interact with their mentors and others from the division, to facilitate the frequently-expressed need of adjuncts for belongingness. Monthly "brown-bag lunches", at which a teaching concept or classroom management technique was presented by a full-time or adjunct instructor, might be an especially valuable activity. Solicitation of feedback from adjuncts might yield merit for hosting a breakfast or "after-work" session which is more convenient for a significant number of adjuncts. An end-of-the year informal social, as conducted during this study, might provide satisfaction for the recognition needs of dedicated adjuncts.

A successful adjunct development initiative should also provide a likely growing number of high-achieving adjuncts with access to materials which they could employ to develop more sophisticated teaching styles. "Faculty development centers", with appropriate materials for improving instruction and classroom management, which also provides space for mentors and mentees to meet and discuss teaching issues, have proven to be highly successful to those community colleges developing them (Lauridsen, 1994).

Successful community colleges continue to assess themselves by one overarching question--"Is it good for the student?" "Is it worth an extra effort to have the best prepared instructor, full-time or adjunct, in every classroom?" is an easy question to answer.

Recommendations for Further Research

As stated earlier, little research has been conducted on the development of adjunct faculty in America's community colleges. The issues which bear on integrating adjunct faculty more effectively will be addressed or they will maim higher education (Roueche, et al., 1995). Therefore, there are many aspects of this issue to study.

While a few exemplary practices, such as the Cuyahoga Community College EPIC Program, have begun to appear in the literature, little if any evaluation of those practices has been conducted. Community colleges vary markedly by the communities which they serve. Simply replicating practices without a more grounded understanding of factors which contributed to their success is not wise. Detailed research on initiatives which have endured and thrived, along with a thorough analysis of the composition of its adjunct faculty pool, is an excellent place to start.

Community colleges which have formally employed mentoring as a developmental tool for its adjuncts are probably institutions which are more likely to have employed other forms of staff development for adjuncts. Research focused on assessing and comparing the relative values of varied developmental methods has the potential to contribute a great deal to our understanding of the larger issue.

Whether formally or informally, mentoring has surely taken place in America's community colleges for decades. Research should be conducted among a range of community colleges to identify adjuncts who have been mentored, seeking a clarification of the benefits it has provided them and how mentored adjuncts' success, e.g., longevity with the institution, student evaluations, compare with those who have not been mentored.

Looking at the issue of adjunct development from a different perspective, it would be interesting to more clearly understand the reasons why community colleges have not employed mentoring or other developmental methods for adjuncts. Although there would no doubt that several obvious issues emerge, e.g., lack of time, lack of perceived benefit, the data gathered might provide those interested in promoting the concept of adjunct mentoring with valuable insight for overcoming obstacles.

Perhaps the most fruitful data would be that which might be gathered from a multi-year study. Baseline data on adjunct performance, turnover and career progress could be gathered from the past year. Data on similar criteria could be gathered on the first year of a community college's implementing a mentoring program, and compared with that for a second year, after an initiative had been fully employed. Such data would provide the administrators of a community college with the detailed information for making effective decisions on continuing, reconceputalizing or terminating their efforts.

While research on the impact of mentoring in the development of adjunct community college faculty is scarce and this researcher identified extensive areas in need of study, the leaders of American community colleges should not delay in employing this tool. Mentoring's potential for enhancing the performance of adjunct faculty and for contributing to the overall development of a "learning organization" far outweigh the minimal investment it requires.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH AGREEMENT AND STUDY OVERVIEW

Research Agreement, between study participants and Richard Lyons

For the period of January 2 through June 30, 1996, the researcher agrees to provide the participant the following:

1. A detailed orientation to the college and the research project, including ample printed support materials, and a perspective on the teaching assignment;

2. Initiate telephone contact with the participant, at a mutually agreed upon frequency, i.e. weekly for the semester's first three weeks, biweekly thereafter;

3. When requested, provide coaching in instructional and classroom management strategies and methods for the delivery of the course to which the participant has been assigned. Such coaching will be delivered in face-to-face meetings, or via telephone. The researcher's office number is 462-4462, or from outlying areas, 930-4722, ext. 4462. His home telephone number is 467-0972;

4. When requested, the researcher will make classroom observations and if desired, videotape presentations, for critiquing with the participant;

5. Clarification of general college policies and procedures and availability of support services, albeit not to supplant that which the participant would normally receive from the key contact person;

6. Opportunities to meet with other participants to share common concerns;

7. Confidentiality of all communications, without the specific permission of the participant. The identification of the participant and nature of communications will be reported anonymously in the researcher's dissertation only.

The participant, **xxxxx xxxxxxx**, agrees to provide the researcher the following:

1. A current resume, or photocopy of the IRCC application form, so as to provide demographic, professional and educational background information;

2. A personal interview, of approximately one hour's length, at three points during the spring semester -- at the beginning, near mid-term and immediately following its close. Interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed for inclusion in the researcher's dissertation;

3. The commitment to participate if at all possible during the entire length of the study, i.e. through June 30, 1996;

4. Access to the completed student evaluations on the participant's teaching assignment for the spring semester, 1996;

5. A journal which contains at least one entry per week during the spring semester of the participant's reflections on occurrences which impact on the participant's development during the spring semester 1996. This journal should be submitted at the time of the final interview.

Richard Lyons, Researcher/ Date

xxxxx xxxxxxx, Participant/ Date

A Study of the Effects of a Mentoring Initiative on the Performance of New Adjunct Community College Faculty

For decades, America's community colleges have prided themselves on being the most dedicated teaching institution within higher education. Attention to students' needs and limitations has been an historic component of the culture of the community college, which is now the primary higher education choice of racial minorities, the economic lower class and older students. Such students are often underprepared for academic reality, are working too many hours, juggling family responsibilities, with insufficient support from family and friends, and are unclear on what they want to do with their lives. Together these factors have greatly impacted the ability of community college faculties to maintain their teaching effectiveness.

In recent years, community colleges have become required to "do more with less." Since personnel expenses comprise the greatest cost of community colleges, many have adopted methods to decrease instructional costs through the wider use of adjunct instructors. While the majority of adjunct community college instructors were once drawn from the ranks of full-time public school teachers and professors at other nearby colleges, administrators could generally have confidence in their pedagogical skills. Currently however, such instructors have dwindled to only thirty percent of total adjunct faculty and the issue of teaching quality has become far more problematic. With per-credit-hour savings exceeding fifty percent, the number of adjuncts continues to grow, constituting an increasingly larger share of teaching assignments. Community colleges risk their ability to maintain their effectiveness with increasingly more challenging student clienteles.

At this point, understaffed community colleges have typically done little more in the way of adjunct development than require attendance at faculty meetings whose agendas have been driven solely by the needs and constraints of the institution, and perhaps develop and furnish an adjunct faculty handbook. Although adjuncts often know their fields extremely well, it can generally only be hoped that they possess adequate pedagogical skills. Although a few courses designed to build teaching skills have been developed, requiring attendance has not proven to be a generally viable solution. One strategy which offers potential for success is mentoring, largely driven by the individual needs of the adjunct and delivered by motivated veteran faculty.

This dissertation will be designed to provide new adjunct faculty maximum input into the development of a mentoring strategy for IRCC. A group of 10 new adjunct faculty from across a wide range of disciplines comprising a representative sample will be selected for mentoring. A series of interviews, using open-ended questioning, will be conducted at key mileposts during the semester. Additional dialogue will occur via researcher-initiated telephone conversations at weekly intervals for the first three weeks of the semester and bi-weekly thereafter, and during participant initiated calls when needed. At the participant's request, observations and videotaping will be used to provide meaningful feedback to facilitate their development. In addition, informal meetings of participants, with the researcher serving as facilitator will be encouraged during the semester.

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDES

GUIDE, INTERVIEW ONE

Expectations, going in

Profile of IRCC student, demographically, capabilities, motivation

Types, degree of support from contact person, e.g. department chair

Types, degree of instructional support from other aspects of college

From your present support network, i.e. employer, family, friends

Teaching strategy, methods you'll use

Level of personal growth/achievement at end of semester

What would you like students to say at end of course on their evaluations of you?

Biggest personal obstacle to overcome to achieve your hoped for success

Demographic, psychographic questions

Description of high school attended

Description of most impactful college class experience

Ever a student at a community college?

Previous teaching experiences, both formal and less formal, e.g. religious education, industry training

Most effective teacher in your career as student, why?

Greatest example of poor teaching in your background? Impactful?

Most significant qualities of an effective teacher?

Motivation to teach as an adjunct?

Who/how was contact to teach initiated?

Title of contact person

What type, amount of interfacing prior to first class?

Race, age, gender

Educational level attained

Present occupation

Other notable work experiences

Have you previously had a mentor? If so, describe.

Any questions as we enter the study?

GUIDE, INTERVIEW TWO

In our first interview, you told me that going into your teaching assignment, you had the following expectations: (Paraphrase from Interview One). In what ways have your expectations been realized?

In what ways have you been surprised? disappointed?

Tell me about the best "teaching moment" you've had so far this semester.

What have been your biggest challenges so far?

Since our first meeting, what sort of contact have you had with your key contact person/department chairperson?

What teaching methods have you used so far? which have worked best? have been least effective?

Have you given an exam and/or have students submitted a major assignment? What do you feel about the results? Are you contemplating any changes in your testing methods?

Have you had to adjust any other plans which affect the remainder of the semester?

Have you ever had a mentor relationship before? Tell me about it.

So far, we've talked, on the phone X times, in person Y times? Is that enough, too much?

What kind of help can I give you today?

GUIDE, INTERVIEW THREE

Could you take a moment and summarize your development as an instructor this semester?

Have you had a chance to review the evaluations submitted by the students in your class? Do they support what your perceptions were? What did you learn from them?

We've tried to provide you the type and amount of mentoring which was ideal for you. Has it been structured enough? too much? not enough?

What are the most important needs you've had during this semester that haven't been addressed by your department chairperson? how has the mentoring from me helped?

How would you describe your needs this semester -- slight, moderate, extensive? What factors do you feel have contributed to the needs you've had?

If my records are correct, I've initiated contact with you X times, and you've called me Y times. Do you wish it had been a little more often? less often? why?

Do you feel the two of us have been an effective mentoring match? What factors, such as age, gender or race, do you think would have made us a better match? Why?

What was your biggest accomplishment in the classroom this semester?

Since we talked at midterm, have you identified anything else you need to improve?

Do you perceive that you're developing your own teaching style? Describe.

Would you teach again next semester if you were asked? Why, why not?

Would you prefer to teach the same course, or another one? Why?

Any closing thoughts or questions?

Thank you for the time and energy you've invested in your teaching assignment, and in participating in this mentoring initiative. Please retain my phone number, and if there is ever anything I can do to help your teaching with us, please give me a call.

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTOR/COURSE EVALUATION FORM

INDIAN RIVER COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INSTRUCTOR/COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Instructor ______________________________ Date ____________________

Course _________________________________ Location ________________

	None used	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
MATERIALS						
1. How useful was the textbook?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Did the instructor provide sufficient written materials?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
INSTRUCTOR						
3. Were instructional methods appropriate and helpful?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Was the amount of material covered by the instructor reasonable?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Was the instructor knowledgeable in the subject area?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Was the material presented in a clear, understandable manner?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Did the instructor start on time and finish on time?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
GENERAL						
8. Did the course meet your objectives?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Overall rating of this seminar or course?		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Did the instructor distribute a syllabus? _____yes _____no

Did the instructor inform you of additional courses in this area____yes ___no

COMMENTS ON THE INSTRUCTOR AND/OR THE COURSE:_______________________________

____

____

____

What other courses/seminars (related or unrelated to this topic) would you like to see offered?

____

____

I R C C 532 (10/93)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D

ORIENTATION CHECKLIST FOR NEW ADJUNCT FACULTY

Orientation Checklist Adjunct Instructor:

I. Personnel related

_____ A. Personnel forms and transcripts

_____ B. Employment Procedures - (Time Sheets, Paychecks, Instructor Absences)

_____ C. Certification/Recertification/Course Reimbursement

_____ D. Address/Change of Address/Phone Number

II. Instructional

_____ A. Overview of college mission/program/curriculum

_____ B. Syllabus/Grading Procedures/Grade Rolls/ Calendar (Holidays)

Provide a syllabus the first class meeting giving name, contact information, course content, text information, and grading information.

_____ C. Class Rolls/Student Attendance (VA/Fin Aid Students)

If you have not received final class roll by the third class meeting, contact Dr. Lyons'office.

Check the roll each class meeting.

Keep grades and attendance current.

_____ D. Student Evaluations -- when, how to administer

Formal evaluation administered at end of term, per instruction enclosed in packet.

_____ E. Classroom Responsibilities/Instructional Time and Breaks/Housekeeping

Arrive early and instruct the class the full scheduled time.

_____ F. Release of Student Information

_____ G. Instructor Attire

_____ H. Books/Bookstore/Materials and Supplies

_____ I. Student Retention/Counseling Forms

_____ J. Protocol/Accident Report/Security

_____ K. Orientation to campus

_____ L. Schedule format

_____ M. Make/no make policy

_____ N. Computer lab policy

III. Resources

____ A. Auxiliary Services
  Audio Visual
  Printshop
  Secretarial Services
  Learning Resources
  Learning Assistance Centers

_____ B. Handbooks
  Adjunct Faculty, Student, College

_____ C. "Instructor Effectiveness Training" course

_____ D. Brown Bag lunches

_____ E. Faculty Development Center (W 222)

IV. Department specific

In addition to the above items, each individual department or discipline may have items pertinent to that specific area. These may include:

_____ A. Parking

_____ B. Forms

_____ C. Keys

_____ D. Mailbox

_____ E. Orientation to Specialized Facilities

_____ F. Equipment (e.g., how to use ScanTron)

_____ G. Opportunity to shadow another faculty member/mentors

_____ H. Course numbering system

_____ I. Recruiting/retention

If you have any problem, first call your department chair. If you do not reach the chair, call Dr. Lyons' office, 462-4729 or 930-4722, ext. 4729.

Date: _____________ Signature of Adjunct: ________________________________

APPENDIX E

"INSTRUCTOR EFFECTIVENESS TRAINING" OUTLINE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructor Effectiveness Training
MNA 1330 AA

This one credit course, developed especially for adjunct faculty of IRCC's Business and Information Technology Division, seeks to provide the fundamental instructional and classroom management skills required in delivering an occupationally-focused course. It satisfies a portion of the six-credits required for recertification each five years. The course will meet from 8:15 a.m. to 12 noon on the dates below, with the objective of anticipating the needs of those teaching during the fall semester. The course is S/U graded, based on attendance, participation and an individual journal. Although no text is required, a three-ring binder is recommended for the materials which will be provided.

August 17 **Planning the Course**
The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Instructors
Utilizing your most valuable resource: the department chair
Resources for planning: textbook, ancillaries, course outlines
Profile of the community college student
Developing an effective syllabus -- your contract with students
Utilizing field trips and guest speakers effectively
Preparing for the first class meeting

August 24 **The First Class Meeting**
Introducing yourself effectively to the class
Establishing an appropriate atmosphere, professionalism
Conducting "icebreakers"
"Student Profiles"
Getting, using class rolls
Managing class time effectively

September 7 **Improving Teaching and Learning**
Develop the exam in advance, study guides
Effective communications techniques
Using "advance organizers", asking questions effectively
Lecturing appropriately
Cooperative and experiential learning
Using audio-visual materials and equipment effectively

September 14 **Evaluating Success**
"Mini-teach" (volunteers)
Exam construction, de-bugging
Scoring exams, using Scantron system
Analyzing test results
Conducting student evaluations: informal and formal

LIST OF REFERENCES

Arden, E. (1995, July 21). Ending the loneliness and isolation of adjunct professors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46(45), A44.

Avakian, A. N. (1995, June/July). Conflicting demands for adjunct faculty. Community College Journal, 65(6), 34-36.

Biles, G. E., & Tuckman, H. P. (1986). Part-time faculty personnel management policies. New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Bridges, W. (1994, September 19). The end of the job. Fortune, 130(6), 61-74.

Candy, P. (1991). Self-direction for lifelong learning. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, M. (1992). Benefits on a budget: Addressing adjunct needs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 355 578)

Cross, K. P. (1994). Involving faculty in TQM through classroom assessment. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), Teaching and learning in the community college (pp. 143-159). Washington, DC: The Community College Press

Davis, S. (1995). The effect of a pedagogically-based staff development program for adjunct community college faculty. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Davis, J. (1993). Better teaching, more learning. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Erwin, J., & Andrews, H. (1993, November/December). State of part-time faculty services at community colleges in a nineteen-state region. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 17(6), 555-562.

Gappa, J., & Leslie, D. (1993). *The invisible faculty: improving the status of part-timers in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gappa, J. (1984). *Part-time faculty: Higher education at the crossroads*. [Association for the Study of Higher Education Research Report Number 3]. Washington, DC: Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Gross, R. (1995, October/November). Defining the future: The new mandate for distance learning in the 21st century. *Community College Journal, 66*(2), 28-33.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead. *Project on the Status and Education of Women.* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Harnish, D., & Wild, L. (1993, May/June). Peer mentoring in higher education: A professional development strategy for faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 17*(3), 271-282.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hill, S., Bahniuk, M., & Dobos, J. (1989, January). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. *Communication education, 38,* 15-33.

Howe, N., & Strauss, B. (1993). *13th gen: Abort, retry, ignore, fail?* New York: Vintage Books.

Kent, N. (1996, May 7). Community colleges confront alternative futures. *Community College Times, 8*(9), 2-3.

Kram, K., & Isabella, L. (1985, March). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. *Academy of Management Journal, 28*(1), 110-132.

Kram, K. (1983, December). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 608-625.

Lankard, B. (1993). Part-time instructors in adult and vocational education. ERIC digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 363 797)

Lauridsen, K. (1994). A contemporary view of teaching and learning centers for faculty. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), Teaching and learning in the community college (pp. 229-244). Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Lee, J., & Maitland, C. (1995, June 5). Faculty profile reveals surprises. Community College Week, 7(21), 4-5.

Levinson, D., Darrow, C., Klein, E., Levinson, M., & McKee, B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Knopf.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (1984). Analyzing social settings. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Maitland, C. (1995, September 25). Part-time faculty in community colleges. Community College Week, 8(4), 4.

Maslow, A. (1987). Motivation and personality (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

McGaughey, J. (1985). Parttime faculty: Integrity and integration. In D. Puyear (Ed.), Maintaining institutional integrity: New directions for community colleges, No. 52. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McGrath, D., & Spear, M. (1988, January/February). A professorate is in trouble, and hardly anyone recognizes it. Change, 20(1), 26, 53.

McGuire, J. (1993, June). Part-time faculty: Partners in excellence. Leadership abstracts, 6(6).

Merriam, S. (1983, Spring). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-173.

Merriam, S. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Banion, T. (1995, December/January). A learning college for the 21st century. Community College Journal, 66(3), 18-23.

O'Banion, T. (1994). Teaching and learning: A mandate for the nineties. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), Teaching and learning in the community college. (pp. 3-20). Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and proteges*. New York: Arbor House.

Quinn, B. J. (1980). *The influence of same-sex and cross-sex mentors on the professional development and personality characteristics of women in human services.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Rawles, B. A. (1980). *The influence of a mentor on the level of self-actualization of American scientists.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Richardson, R. C. (1992, Summer). The associate program: Teaching improvement for adjunct faculty. *Community College Review, 20*(1), 29-34.

Roche, G. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review, 20*(24), 26-28.

Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1995). *Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges.* Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Roueche, J., & Roueche, S. (1994). Creating the climate for teaching and learning. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *Teaching and learning in the community college* (pp. 21-40). Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Sands, R., Parson, L., & Duane, J. (1991, March/April). Faculty mentoring faculty in a public university. *Journal of Higher Education, 62*(2), 174-193.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York: Currency-Doubleday.

Shapiro, E., Haseltine, F., & Rowe, M. (1978, Spring). Moving up: Role models, mentors and the patron system. *Sloan Management Review, 19,* 51-58.

Sheehy, G. (1995). *New passages.* New York: Random House.

Tuckman, H. P. (1978, December). Who is part-time in academe? *AAUP bulletin,* pp. 305-315.

Vaillant, G. (1977). *Adaptation to life.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company.

Valent, R. (1992). Community college part-time faculty: Factors which influence their expressed staff development needs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Widener University, Chester, PA.

Witt, A., Wattenbarger, J., Gollattscheck, J., & Suppiger, J. (1994). America's community colleges: The first century. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.

Yantz, P., & Bechtold, C. (1994, February). Part-time faculty: here today, not gone tomorrow, or professional development of part-time faculty and the changing role of division chairpersons. Paper presented at the International Conference for Community College Chairs, Deans and other Instructional Leaders, Phoenix, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 369 428)